THE MEMORIAL LIBRARY
Southwestern College

QUARTERLY JOURNAL of SPEECH

Speech Association of America

OCTOBER · 1959
Volume XLV · Number 3

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

1915 — 1959

Published by

THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

Editor

Donald C. Bryant

11-A Schaeffer Hall
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Editor-Elect

Richard Murphy

University of Illinois

Associate Editors

Carroll C. Arnold	BRITISH PUBLIC ADDRESS	Cornell University
Wallace A. Bacon	INTERPRETATION	Northwestern University
Earnest S. Brandenburg	ADULT EDUCATION	Washington University
Robert D. Clark	HOMILETICS AND PREACHING	University of Oregon
Carl A. Dallinger	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	State University of Iowa
Douglas Ehninger	PUBLIC SPEAKING AND FORENSICS	University of Florida
Leland M. Griffin	AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS	Northwestern University
Robert G. Gunderson	NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW	Indiana University
Warren Guthrie	TV AND RADIO	Western Reserve University
Marie K. Hochmuth	RHETORIC AND CRITICISM	University of Illinois
John V. Irwin	SPEECH AND HEARING	University of Wisconsin
Magdalene Kramer	TEACHING OF SPEECH	Teachers College, Columbia University
Richard Murphy	SHOP TALK	University of Illinois
David Potter	BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL SPEAKING	Michigan State University
Claude L. Shaver	DRAMA AND THEATRE	Louisiana State University
C. K. Thomas	PHONETICS	University of Florida
William E. Utterback	DISCUSSION	Ohio State University

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH is published in the months of February, April, October, and December. Contributions prepared in accordance with THE MLA STYLE SHEET may be sent to the Editor or to the appropriate Associate Editor. Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to Owen Peterson, Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge 3, Louisiana.

Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice at Columbia, Missouri, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Regular subscription price $5.50 per year. Special subscriptions for undergraduate students $3.50 per year. Single copy of current issue $1.50. A comprehensive Index of the issues of the year is bound in each December JOURNAL. The contents are also indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX. For volumes prior to 1929 consult the READERS GUIDE TO PERIODICAL LITERATURE. For complete, analytical coverage through 1954, see INDEX TO THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, VOLUMES I-XL, 1915-1954, compiled by Giles W. Gray (1956). Volumes I-III were published under the title THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING; Volumes IV-XIII, THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION.

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOL. XLV · OCTOBER 1959 · NO. 3

The Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory, 1806-1904: A Case Study in Changing Concepts of Rhetoric and Pedagogy — *Ronald F. Reid* — 239

Readers or Rhapsodes? — *Hugh Dickinson* — 258

Muse to Medusa: Notes on the New York Theatre, 1958-1959 — *Alan S. Downer* — 264

Electronic Media in the Soviet Union — *E. W. Ziebarth* — 275

Decision by Debate: A Re-examination — *Douglas Ehninger* — 282

Benjamin F. Butler, Prosecutor — *Gordon L. Thomas* — 288

Predicting the Content of Short Phrases — *John W. Black* — 299

John P. Altgeld on Oratory — *Huber W. Ellingsworth* — 304

The Forum — 309

- Revised Constitution and By-Laws — 309
- Election of Officers — 320
- Votes on Constitutional Amendments — 321
- Questions on Questions — *Walter F. Stromer* — 321
- A Footnote on Hawaiian Orthography — *Cj Stevens* — 323

New Books in Review — *Robert G. Gunderson* — 325

- Current Theory and Research in Motivation — *Andrew Thomas Weaver* — 325
- Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument — *Edwin Black* — 330
- The King's War, 1641-1647 — *Goodwin F. Berquist, Jr.* — 331
- Stephen A. Douglas, Defender of the Union — *Waldo W. Braden* — 331
- Benjamin Harrison, Hoosier Statesman: From the Civil War to the White House, 1865-1888 — *Victor M. Powell* — 332

Congress and the American Tradition	*Robert P. Friedman*	332
Propaganda Analysis: A Study of Inferences Made From Nazi Propaganda in World War II	*W. A. Dahlberg*	333
The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in Time of Crisis	*Anthony Hillbruner*	333
Theatre Arts Publications in the United States 1947-1952: A Five Year Bibliography	*Kalman A. Burnim*	334
The Sovereign Flower. . . . *and* Shakespeare's Festive Comedy: A Study of Dramatic Form and Its Relation to Social Custom	*Albert B. Weiner*	335
The Broken Compass: A Study of the Major Comedies of Ben Johnson	*Herbert Feinstein*	336
J. M. Synge, 1871-1909	*Robert R. Crosby*	337
The Literary Symbol	*Frances Lea McCurdy*	338
Coming of Age: New and Selected Poems	*Don Geiger*	338
Literature as Experience	*Jonathan W. Curvin*	339
Manual of Phonetics	*Lee S. Hultzén*	339
Toward Understanding Stuttering *and* The Onset of Stuttering: Research Findings and Implications	*Charlotte G. Wells*	340
Oral Interpretation	*L. LaMont Okey*	341
The Cerebral-Palsied Child: A Guide for Parents	*Edmund C. Nuttall*	341
The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens	*Gladys L. Borchers*	342
How to Hold a Better Meeting	*Henry L. Ewbank, Jr.*	342
Briefing and Conference Techniques	*Gerald Phillips*	343
Effective Speech for Democratic Living	*Lloyd I. Watkins*	343
Correct Speaking; Adult Speaking; Effective Speaking; *and* Planned Speaking	*Francis E. X. Dance*	343
Your Speech Reveals Your Personality *and* The Art of Listening	*Kenneth W. Pauli*	344
Shop Talk	*Richard Murphy*	345

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLV OCTOBER 1959 NUMBER 3

THE BOYLSTON PROFESSORSHIP OF RHETORIC AND ORATORY, 1806-1904: A CASE STUDY IN CHANGING CONCEPTS OF RHETORIC AND PEDAGOGY

Ronald F. Reid

1.

THE latter part of the eighteenth century saw a profound change in American university education: the system of class tutors was replaced by one in which each tutor specialized in an academic field. Philanthropists were then encouraged to endow specialized professorial chairs. One benefactor, Nicholas Boylston, a wealthy Boston merchant who died in 1771, willed Harvard College £1500 for the endowment of the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory. The professorship was one of the earliest to be endowed at Harvard, though insufficient income delayed its activation until 1806.

In the period under consideration, five men occupied the Boylston chair: John Quincy Adams, 1806-1809; Joseph McKean, 1809-1818; Edward T. Channing, 1819-1851; Francis James Child, 1851-1876; Adams Sherman Hill, 1876-1904. The purpose of this essay is not to discuss thoroughly each professor's rhetorical theory and pedagogical method, but to explore the changes in the basic concerns of rhetoric during the nineteenth century at Harvard. In 1806, rhetoric was concerned primarily with persuasive oratory and sunk its roots deeply in the classical tradition. By the time of Hill's retirement, what was called "rhetoric" was concerned not with oratory, but with written composition, expository and literary as well as persuasive, and made little direct reference to classical authors. And not even these new concerns were those of the Boylston professorship, which abandoned rhetoric for literature, oratory for poetry.

Such a dramatic shift of focus took place not only at Harvard, but in higher education generally. This paper, therefore, is a case study in changing concepts of rhetoric during the nineteenth century.

2.

In 1801, Ward Nicholas Boylston threatened to sue Harvard because no Boylston professor had yet been ap-

Mr. Reid (Ph.D., Purdue, 1951) is Assistant Professor of Speech at Purdue University.

pointed. The lawsuit never materialized, but Harvard activated the professorship. A committee of the Corporation prepared statutes which required the professor (1) to meet the freshmen twice a week to discuss a classical text, portions of which students were to recite in English; (2) to meet the sophomores twice a week, devoting the first half-year to studying an English text, portions of which students were to recite from memory, and the second half to student delivery of non-original dialogues, speeches, and declamations and the writing of translations and original compositions;[1] (3) to meet the juniors fortnightly to instruct from the English text started the previous year and to correct written compositions; (4) to meet the seniors fortnightly to correct written compositions; (5) to assist students who were to speak at public exhibitions; (6) to deliver weekly public lectures to the two upper classes and resident graduates; (7) to preside at weekly declamations of the two upper classes.[2]

The statutes relied heavily upon classical pedagogical and rhetorical doctrines. Classical rhetorical pedagogy consisted of three fundamental parts: study of theory, practice, and exercises in imitation. The requirement of texts and public lectures gave theory an important role in the statutes' prescribed pedagogy. Practice in speaking and writing was demanded of all four classes. The requirement of as much written as oral practice did not mean that the statutes-writers were not primarily interested in oratory, for classical teachers considered written exercises as part of oratorical training.

Ancient teachers gave their students three exercises in imitation: memorization (of textbooks as well as literary and oratorical models), translation, and paraphrase, all of which were preceded by the teacher's analysis of the model.[3] The statutes required only the first two exercises and did not demand analysis of models; but, albeit truncated, imitation was integral to the statutes' pedagogical prescription.

The statutes' outline of rhetorical theory, as it was to be developed in the public lectures, was rigidly classical. The professor was to begin his lectures with an historical and biographical account of ancient oratory and orators. He was to explain rhetoric's nature, object, and several kinds and to show its connection with the powers of the human mind. Rhetoric was to be divided into four parts, to be discussed in the following manner:

> More particularly, under the head of *Invention* he shall treat of internal and external topics, the state of a controversy, the different arguments, proper to demonstrative, deliberative, and judicial discourses; of the character and address of a finished orator, and of the use and excitation of the passions.
>
> Under the head of *Disposition* he shall treat of the properties and uses of each of the parts of a regular discourse, such as Introduction, Narration, Proposition, Confirmation, Confutation, and Conclusion; adding suitable remarks on digression, transition, and amplification.
>
> Under the head of *Elocution,* he shall treat generally and largely of Elegance, Composition, and Dignity, and of their respective requisites; and then particularly of the several

[1] Although the statutes do not state specifically that the dialogues, speeches, and declamations were to be non-original, the context implies it. Furthermore, *The Laws of Harvard College* (Cambridge, 1807) states that underclassmen are "to read, or deliver memoriter, *some celebrated orations, speeches, or dialogues,* [italics mine] in Latin or English, whereby they may be directed or assisted in their elocution and pronunciation." P. 6.

[2] The statutes were adopted at a Corporation meeting, April 30, 1804; MS Harvard College Records, IV, 9ff., Harvard Archives.

[3] See Donald Lemen Clark, *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education* (Morningside Heights, New York, 1957), esp. pp. 169ff; *John Milton at St. Paul's School* (New York, 1948), esp. pp. 168ff.

species of style, as the low, middle, sublime &c. and of their distinguishing qualities, with respect both to thoughts and the words, illustrating the same by proper examples; and likewise of the various style [sic] of epistles, dialogues, history, poetry, and orations.

Under the head of *Pronunciation* he shall urge the immense importance of a good delivery, and treat particularly of the management of the voice and of gesture; interspersing due cautions against what is awkward or affected, with directions for the attainment of proper action, and incessantly pressing the superior excellence of a natural manner.[4]

Finally, the professor was to discuss the sermon, the methods of improving in eloquence (such as reading, writing, speaking, and imitation) and the "good orator" maxim. He was also to comment on characteristic features of celebrated speakers and writers throughout the lectures.

The second incumbent, Joseph McKean, stated explicitly that the statutes were modeled upon John Ward's *A System of Oratory*, an eighteenth century compendium of classical doctrine.[5] McKean's statement merits our belief, for he knew some of the statutes' writers. Furthermore, probability suggests Ward as the source. Ward was widely used in America until about 1780;[6] the statutes were written by mature men a quarter-century later. Being laymen, they needed a source. Trained in the classical tradition, it would be natural for them to look to the major interpreter of that tradition.

Finally, comparison of Ward and the statutes reveals remarkable similarity. The organizational schemes are identical, not only in the over-all organization of material, but also in lower levels of subordination. Of special interest is the fact that the statutes required under disposition a lecture on transition, amplification, and digression and, under elocution, lectures on various literary forms, for these methods of synthesizing classical doctrine were unique to Ward in eighteenth century England. Without exception, both Ward and the statutes used the same classical author as the source of a given topic.[7]

3.

Ward Nicholas Boylston's abandonment of his threatened lawsuit was not without its *quid pro quo*, part of which was considerable voice in selecting the first professor. His favorite candidate was his friend, lawyer, and distant relative, John Quincy Adams.[8]

The offer of the professorship, officially tendered in the summer of 1805, tempted Adams. His support of Jefferson's foreign policy was alienating him from the Massachusetts Federalists, and his political future looked bleak.[9] How-

[4] Harvard College Records, IV, 10ff.

[5] Joseph McKean, Lectures on rhetoric and oratory delivered to his classes in Harvard College; MS in Harvard Archives.

[6] Warren Guthrie, "The Development of Rhetorical Theory in America, 1635-1850," *Speech Monographs*, XIV (1947), 45.

[7] Donald M. Goodfellow, in his "The First Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory," *New England Quarterly*, XIX (September 1946), 372-89, conjectures (p. 376) that the article on oratory in the third edition of the *Encyclopedia Brittanica* (1797) was the source of the statutes. Even if Goodfellow is correct, Ward is the model for the statutes, for the article not only refers the reader to Ward's *System*, but also is clearly a digest of that treatise. However, the article omits certain material which is in the *System* and which is called for by the statutes. Ward devotes several lectures to the styles of various types of composition, such as epistles and dialogues, but the *Encyclopedia* discusses only the style of the orator; similarly, there is nothing in the article about the methods of improving in eloquence (imitation, etc.), a subject which Ward considers at some length. Consequently, it seems more likely that the men who prepared the statutes had a copy of the *System* before them as they wrote.

[8] For additional details regarding the establishment of the professorship and Ward Nicholas Boylston's role in getting Adams elected, see Goodfellow, pp. 373ff. Adams's grandmother, Abagail, and Nicholas Boylston were cousins.

[9] See Samuel Flagg Bemis, *John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy* (New York, 1949), p. 132.

ever, he was unwilling to abandon public life. He answered the Corporation that his Senatorial duties "indeed may be temporary, and cease in the course of a few years, but they will be followed by others which would render a constant residence or attendance at Cambridge through the year alike impracticable for me."[10] So eager was the Corporation to obtain Adams's services that it offered the chair on a part-time basis and allowed him to indicate which duties he would fulfill. He agreed to deliver the public lectures, preside at the declamations of the three upper classes, and help students prepare for exhibitions. He reserved the right to absent himself when Senatorial or other business necessitated.[11]

As a critic of declamation, Adams was concerned with the students' delivery, selection of pieces, and especially the "almost universal neglect of Memory [which] has crept on to such a degree, altogether from the indulgence in the College, which I am endeavouring to reform."[12] When presiding at declamations, he urged students to "discard their prompters, of their own choice, and advised them to let the Speaker always stand alone in the box." "The difficulty," he complained, "is to give them a taste for this exercise, which they now dislike more than any other that is required of them."[13]

As time passed, he became more pleased with the declamations, or at least complained about them less in his diary. A year after assuming the professorship, he was surprised when one speaker used a prompter.[14]

Early in the preparation of his public lectures, Adams objected to the rigidity of the statutes: "I have also to remark that the minuteness of detail into which this same Article [the one prescribing the content of the lectures] enters, to prescribe the particulars of this Course, appears to me altogether unnecessary, and if to be adhered to, according to the letter, would impose upon me shackles, to which I am not inclined to submit. The divisions and subdivisions of the Science, and the proper means for pursuing its study might, I suppose in general be left to the Judgment of the Professor."[15] As independent a man as Adams would no doubt have departed substantially from the statutes had he desired. But his modifications were minor, the only noteworthy ones being (1) restoration of memory as one of the five parts of rhetoric, (2) omission of the low-middle-grand stylistic classification, (3) failure to discuss the styles of various types of compositions, and (4) transfer of amplification from the lecture on digression and transition to the one on conclusion.

Adams's adherence to the statutes placed his lectures in the classical tradition. After a few lectures on the history of ancient rhetoric and oratory, he divided rhetoric into its five classical divisions. Invention was developed with lectures on the state of the controversy, topics, the arguments proper to each type of oration, the character of the speaker, and the passions. Disposition was discussed in terms of Cicero's six parts of an oration, with an additional

[10] To Samuel Dexter Exq.—Chairman of the Committee of the Corporation and Overseers of Harvard University, Quincy, 6 August 1805; John Quincy Adams, Letterbook, reel 135, Microfilms of the Adams Papers owned by the Adams Manuscript Trust and deposited in the Massachusetts Historical Society. This and subsequent quotations from the Adams Papers are used with the kind permission of the Adams Manuscript Trust.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] John Quincy Adams, Diary, August 27, 1806; reel 30, microfilms.

[13] *Ibid.*, July 3, 1806.

[14] *Ibid.*, July 10, 1807.

[15] To the Corporation of Harvard University, Cambridge, 26 June 1806; Letterbook, reel 135, microfilms.

lecture on digression and transition. Elocution was considered from a classical point of view, though he was not nearly so meticulous as the ancients in his catalogue of tropes and figures or in his stylistic classifications. Memory, to which Adams devoted only one lecture, was primarily a report of classical concepts. His lecture on delivery was drawn mostly from Quintilian and Cicero. He did not consider it appropriate to delve into detailed rules of voice and gesture but "The elements of criticism by Lord Kaimes, and the various writings of Sheridan and Walker upon elocution and the art of reading," he told his students, "will deserve your particular attention and study."[16]

On the rare occasions when Adams mentioned modern English rhetoricians, it was usually to disagree with them. Modern rhetoricians' objections to artificial inventional schemes were refuted and Blair's distinction between literal and figurative language pronounced unclear.[17]

Adams, though by his own admission a novice on rhetoric, did not allow his respect for classical writers to prevent him from disagreeing with them at times. For example, he thought Quintilian's "good man" concept not only unrealistic, but harmful; for it might cause students to think that a man was good merely because he happened to be an effective speaker.[18] He objected frequently to the minute divisions and sub-divisions to which classical rhetoricians reduced the science. Disposition especially seemed to him to be meticulous beyond the point of endurance—even his own lectures on the subject seemed dull.[19]

More importantly, Adams recognized the need to modernize some aspects of classical theory. He sometimes reported parts of classical doctrine not for their applicability, but to give his students an historical over-view of the subject. In his own words,

> The purpose of my lectures . . . has been in the first instance to make you familiarly acquainted with the principles, transmitted in the writings of the ancient rhetorical masters; and in the next to discriminate those parts of their precepts, which were inseparably connected with the social institutions and manners of the ages and nations, for which they wrote, from those, which, being founded upon the broad and permanent basis of human nature, are still applicable, and will ever retain their force.[20]

This purpose often led Adams to discuss the relationship between social institutions and rhetoric. For example, although he reported the classical *status* system, he advised his students to use his own modified scheme; the modification was necessitated by the differences in the legal systems of the ancient world and the United States.[21] Similarly, Adams often illustrated principles of deliberative oratory with parliamentary rules and procedures of modern political assemblies.[22]

Basically, then, Adams's lectures were a mixture of instruction on composition and delivery, rhetorical criticism, and an historical sketch of rhetoric. In

[16] John Quincy Adams, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory* (Cambridge, 1810), II, 384.
[17] *Ibid.*, I, 208, 226ff; II, 256-7.
[18] *Ibid.*, I, 157ff, 344ff.
[19] After delivering his lecture on narration, he wrote in his diary: "It was the dullest I have yet delivered, and my only resource was to read it over as fast as possible. Though as long as any of those which have taken me from 40 minutes to three quarters of an hour, I went through it in 32 minutes."—June 19, 1807; reel 30, microfilms.
[20] Adams, *Lectures*, I, 321; see also II, 140-1.
[21] *Ibid.*, I, 297ff.
[22] For example, Adams said that the classical deliberative argument of legality would have no weight in cases where the deliberating body had the power of changing the law, such as a town meeting. *Ibid.*, I, 260.

general, they were classical (though not slavishly so), not because he was afraid to violate the statutes, or because he lacked originality, but because he believed sincerely in classicism's vitality and usefulness in the nineteenth century.

Others shared Adams's belief. Prominent Bostonians often attended his lectures from time to time. The lower classmen also went to hear his public lectures until, as one reported, "requested by Mr. Adams not to do so as we were to hear the course in turn the following year."[23] After Adams resigned in the summer of 1809 to accept a diplomatic appointment, his students requested that he publish his lectures. He left the manuscript with two friends, Judge Davis and the Reverend Joseph Buckminster, who made only minor changes concerning capitalization and punctuation and omitted a few remarks relating to the opening or closing of a term and a few unfavorable comments on contemporaries, before sending it to the printer.

4.

The Corporation lost no time in replacing Adams, electing Joseph McKean on August 26, 1809. Interestingly, McKean, a former minister, was known primarily for his mathematical ability. He had previously declined the Hollis Professorship of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy because of ill health. But specialization was still only a budding phenomenon, and it was not unusual for a person to be offered chairs in different fields.

Inasmuch as McKean was a full-time professor, the Corporation outlined his duties much as they had originally been envisioned, except that he had no responsibility for teaching freshmen. He was required to deliver private lectures to the sophomores on Blair, to deliver public lectures to the upperclassmen, and to criticize various oral and written exercises.[24]

McKean's tenure resulted in no radical change in the concept of rhetoric. Less original than Adams, McKean organized his public lectures in strict accordance with the statutes. There is considerable internal evidence that he relied heavily upon John Ward in his classical treatment of rhetoric.[25]

Nevertheless, McKean's public lectures foreshadowed changes to come. There were traces of Blair and numerous references to Campbell, especially when treating emotional proof. Furthermore, although McKean defended the inventional schemes of status and topics against Blair's charge of pedantry, he was less enthusiastic about their utility than Adams. His frequent praise of Campbell and his occasional objections to the stringency of the statutes make one wonder whether his lectures might not have been modeled upon the creative English rhetorics if he had possessed a free hand. The statutes served as a dam to protect a rigidly-interpreted classicism from an English flood—but the dam was beginning to leak.

5.

The Corporation had difficulty in finding an acceptable replacement for McKean, largely because of the small income earned from the endowment. A year after McKean's death in 1818, the president of Harvard wrote George Ban-

[23] Edward Everett, MS Autobiography, chp. 5, p. 24; Everett Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

[24] Corporation meeting, March 6, 1810; Harvard College Records, IV, 235.

[25] My full discussion of Joseph McKean's public lectures and rhetoric and oratory is in preparation for a future article.

croft that "Whether it will be vacant longer or be committed to Mr. Nicholls of Portland, Mr. Davis, Mr. Daniel Oliver of Salem, to Mr. Ed. T. Channing, to Mr. Frothingham [who had been McKean's assistant for several years], Mr. Brazer or Mr. Quincy, cannot be told."[26] In the fall of 1819, a decision was made. The Corporation elected Channing, a young lawyer who was spending more time editing the struggling young *North American Review* than he was on his meager law practice.

Channing's election aroused a storm of protest. Critics noted that he had been expelled from Harvard in the student rebellion of 1807, charged mediocrity, and whispered that his election was due only to the prominence of his brother, William Ellery Channing.

Channing also had defenders. Under the pen-name of *Popularis Aura* one Channing supporter suggested that his critics were evidently modest, for they wrote anonymously and had not been elected overseers.[27] If he is young, wrote *Fenelon*, so was Pitt when he became prime minister and so are many of the other professors.[28] *Justice*, after maintaining that college appointments were not fit subjects for public controversy, entered the debate by defending Channing's talents both as speaker and editor.[29]

The controversy would be merely a matter of interest, but not of significance, to historians of rhetoric were it not for the common argument that, regardless of the *degree* of Channing's talents, he did not have the *right kind*. *Alumnus*, singularly unimpressed with the fact that Channing was editor of a literary magazine, wrote a slashing attack in which he expressed surprise that the Corporation would elect anyone other than "an *able, practical orator*" and urged the appointment of someone "who had some acquaintance with public speaking in its various forms, and who had moreover some knowledge of mankind, and of the nature & operations of our government, derived from actual observation and experience."[30]

Although explicitly acknowledging Channing's ability, *Harvard* made much the same point:

> It cannot, however, be pretended that an editor of a Review need possess all those qualifications, which are deemed essential to a Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. An acquaintance with the rules of criticism by no means implies a thorough knowledge of the principles of oratory. A person may be a good writer, and in the same time an indifferent speaker. Indeed, it is not a very difficult thing to write a tolerable essay; and to compose a decent oration, according to the rules of art, does not require superior powers of mind, and is not perhaps beyond the reach of ordinary talents. But to excel in public speaking, and to become an accomplished orator, has justly been considered among the highest efforts of human genius. In this Country, which opens a wide field for the display of eloquence, its importance will be duly estimated. The genius of our government, its popular character which pervades all its civil institutions, seems to invite the highest exercise of this sublime art. In short, here, as in the Republics of Greece and Rome, eloquence is power, and almost every thing comes under its dominion.

Although agreeing that the policy of hiring young, studious men was good, *Harvard* continued:

> But, we think the department of Rhetoric and Oratory furnishes an exception. Some experience and practice in the various forms

[26] John T. Kirkland to George Bancroft, Cambridge, May 26, 1819; Bancroft Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

[27] *Boston Daily Advertiser*, September 5, 1819, p. 2.

[28] *Independent Chronicle & Boston Patriot*, September 29, 1819, p. 2.

[29] *Boston Daily Advertiser*, September 29, 1819, p. 2; *Columbian Centinel*, October 2, 1819, p. 1.

[30] *Independent Chronicle & Boston Patriot*, September 25, 1819, p. 1.

of public speaking, as well as knowledge of books, are essential to a teacher of oratory. The art of persuasion, the power of producing conviction by addressing the passions, the feelings, the prejudices, and the understandings of men, cannot be thoroughly acquired in the closet. Besides, the Professor in that branch should be able to instruct by example, to rouse the genius and excite the emulation of youth by exhibiting before them a model for imitation.[31]

These critics may have been dreaming of the days when a United States Senator had caused considerable stir on the campus. But more than nostalgia was involved. Implicit in their views were some traditional ideas about rhetorical pedagogy: a teacher should be a good model; rhetorical doctrine must come from experience as well as from books; rhetoric and literature are separate disciplines; rhetoric is closely related to politics; oratory, not writing, is rhetoric's major concern.

6.

Although Channing's duties paralleled McKean's, his performance of them changed strikingly the nature of rhetoric. His public lectures, most of which were published after his death, bore little resemblance to those of Adams and McKean.[32]

First, Channing broadened the scope of rhetoric by his well-known definition of it as

> a body of rules derived from experience and observation, extending to all communication by language and designed to make it efficient. It does not ask whether a man is to be a speaker or writer,—a poet, philosopher, or debater; but simply,—is it his wish to be put in the right way of communicating his mind with power to others, by words spoken or written. If so, rhetoric undertakes to show him rules or principles which will help to make the expression of his thoughts effective.[33]

Whereas McKean was primarily concerned with persuasion and distinguished rhetoric from poetic on the basis of the former having utility as its purpose and the latter having pleasure, Channing specifically objected to the "arbitrary and unwise" limitation of rhetoric to persuasion and broadened it to include poetry.[34] Persuasion, to affect the emotions, he argued,

> appeals to a man's imagination and taste,—to his sense of beauty and grandeur and moral excellence,—to his sense of wit and humor and irony and satire. . . . And surely the written book, the novel, the history, the fable and the acted play make their approaches to the heart in the same direction and by use of the same methods.[35]

Channing made one seemingly significant limitation on his broad definition:

> It has nothing to do with the different departments of the Belles Lettres, as so many distinct forms of writing. It has nothing to do with an analysis of poetry, history, fiction, biography, the drama, &c., or with their laws or beauties. It leaves this whole field of criticism to other laborers, and limits its inspection of general literature to the purpose of ascertaining and illustrating the essentials of accurate and forcible expression in all good composition.[36]

In short, rhetoric was concerned with composition, not with criticism.

Despite his theoretical exclusion of criticism from rhetoric's domain, Channing did much to identify criticism with rhetoric. His public lectures, which by 1833 were entitled "Rhetoric and Criti-

[31] *Columbian Centinel*, September 22, 1819, p. 2.

[32] Edward T. Channing, *Lectures Read to the Seniors in Harvard College* (Boston, 1856). In the preface, he wrote that "I have taken but a part of the course for publication." (p. vi). Unfortunately, his lecture MSS have not been found.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 31. For further discussion of his definition, see Dorothy I. Anderson, "Edward T. Channing's Definition of Rhetoric," *Speech Monographs*, XIV (1947), 81-92.

[34] Channing, pp. 32ff.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

cism," were, as Wolff observes, "descriptive and critical rather than practical; he gives a student standards by which to judge existing discourse rather than assistance in producing his own."[37]

In the published version, almost half the lectures (eight of twenty) were devoted to demonstrative, deliberative, judicial, and pulpit oratory; but, unlike his predecessors' lectures, they gave no instruction in analysis or composition. His lecture on deliberative oratory, for example, was a critical discussion of the relationship of deliberative speaking to free institutions. There was no consideration of how a deliberative speech should be organized, nothing about the arguments to be employed or the emotions to be aroused.

Of the remaining lectures, three were clearly literary, as the titles—"Literary Tribunals," "Forms of Criticism," "Permanent Literary Fame"—suggest. Other lectures treated topics such as "The Orator and His Times," "The Study of Our Own Language," the writer's preparation and habits of reading.

Examination of the lecture notes of one of his students for 1833 reveals even more clearly the critical bias of the lectures. Of the twenty-one lectures, probably the year's total, the first six treated the four types of oratory, corresponding to the eight such lectures in the published version. The next five were on literary criticism: two on the forms of criticism, one on poetry, one on criticism of poems and novels, one an analysis of Scott's novels. The remaining lectures corresponded roughly to the latter lectures in the book.[38]

Channing's criticism in some respects was rhetorical, as when he analyzed the characteristics of American legal oratory and drew distinctions between legal and political oratory.[39] However, the criticism was mostly literary.

Channing made other significant departures from his predecessors' theories. He abandoned not only the classical pattern of organizing his lectures, but also the classical orientation of much of the theory. Invention was stripped of its analytical schemes. Regarding such aids, one student took the following notes:

> The "Invention" of the ancients signifies the discovery of whatever belongs to the subject. To aid it they invented "Topics" or "Communes loci"—Though pedantic in their character, these Topics are founded on observation of the course of the mind—They are generalizations of the usual trains of thought—*They are of no practical use*—A great thinker needs no artificial aid. A superficial thinker would only become an endless talker, concealing his ignorance in the use of forms.[40]

Moreover, Channing's lectures contained no detailed accounts of emotional and ethical proof, which were integral to Adams's and McKean's classical doctrine.

Inasmuch as Channing disapproved of artificial aids in analysis, it is not surprising that he applied the same principle to synthesis. Disposition was almost completely ignored. Although there were some general statements about judgment, there was no detailed treatment of the functions and methods of the various parts of an oration.

Channing's discussion of style embodied some classical concepts; but there was nothing like McKean's detailed treatment of elocution, in which style was divided into elegance (consisting of perspicuity and purity), composition (consisting of period, order,

[37] Samuel Lee Wolff, "Scholars," *The Cambridge History of American Literature* (New York, 1921), IV, 472.

[38] H. Burroughs, Notes on the lectures of Professor Channing. On Rhetoric and Criticism—1833. . . . MS in Harvard Archives.

[39] Channing, pp. 99ff.; 113ff.

[40] Burroughs. Italics mine.

juncture, and number) and dignity (consisting of tropes and figures). Instead, Channing discussed only general concepts, setting forth the view that precision (not persuasiveness) was the main ingredient of good style. Ornament was permissible—if it did not interfere with precision—but he urged caution in selecting tropes and figures.[41]

Channing departed from classical precept not in his rhetorical theory only; his pedagogical practice modified significantly the classical three-fold approach of theory, imitation, and practice. Channing taught theory; but, as set forth in his lectures, it was very general, devoid of detailed instructions. Only in part was this generality corrected by reliance on textbooks. Channing continued using Blair for a number of years but later discontinued it, and, after considerable experimentation, finally settled upon books II and III of Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, together with Ebenezer Porter's *Analysis of Rhetorical Delivery* and Lowth's *Grammar*, for the sophomores; Whately's *Logic* for the juniors; and Whately's *Rhetoric* for the seniors.[42] Even *in toto* his selections from these texts were limited to grammar, style, delivery, and logical argumentation; there was little on non-logical rhetorical invention or disposition.

The doctrine of imitation was severely modified, for Channing objected to its fundamental premise, the use of models.[43] Furthermore, he believed that "Translations are difficult exercises for young writers, & are apt to give their styles the manner of a foreign idiom."[44] Memorization of texts, however, continued.

Practice also continued, though a subtle but significant shift of emphasis from speaking to writing took place. Although the statutes, like Channing, believed that the same rhetorical principles applied to both speaking and writing, it is nonetheless significant that in his lectures Channing usually used the word "writer." It was "A Writer's Preparation" and "A Writer's Habits," not a speaker's preparation or habits.

Furthermore, Channing, although a rigorous critic of themes, was an indifferent critic of declamation. Former students frequently remembered him as a theme-corrector, but there is a paucity of references to his oratorical teaching.[45] One of the few who did record something wrote: "Mr. Channing listened attentively to these declamations and marked them, I think, on a scale of twenty-four; but he never made any comment, unless it were to rebuke the choice of a piece offensively coarse, or some outrageous grotesqueness in delivery."[46]

However, Channing bemoaned the deficiencies in his students' delivery and believed that elocutionary instruction would help.[47] He therefore persuaded the overseers to employ an assistant to supervise additional exercises in declamation. His first assistant was a zealous elocutionist, Jonathan Barber, famous for his bamboo wheel, which en-

[41] Channing, pp. 246ff.

[42] For a more detailed discussion of Channing's experiments with texts, see Dorothy I. Anderson, "Edward T. Channing's Teaching of Rhetoric," *Speech Monographs*, XVI (August 1949), 70ff.

[43] See [Edward T. Channing], "On Models in Literature," *North American Review*, III (July 1816), 202-209.

[44] Burroughs.

[45] George F. Hoar, for example, in his *Autobiography of Seventy Years* (New York, 1903), comments on Channing's criticism of themes (I, 87, 97, 123); but, despite his deep interest in oratory, he is silent on Channing as a teacher of public speaking.

[46] Andrew P. Peabody, *Harvard Reminiscences* (Boston, 1888), p. 89. Peabody also comments (p. 88) on Channing's own awkward delivery.

[47] For his defense of elocution as a study, see Channing, pp. 46ff.

abled him to teach gestures in all 360 degrees to—alas—an unappreciative student body.[48] After Barber's departure, Channing had a number of assistants, most of them young graduates who stayed for a short time while engaging in further studies of their own.

Many of Channing's departures from classicism can be traced to British influence. With the entire intellectual atmosphere permeated with British thought, it was inevitable that British literary and rhetorical concepts would ultimately dominate American rhetoric.[49]

As Ehninger points out, all three major British rhetoricians—Blair, Whately, and Campbell—made significant departures from classical doctrine.[50] For example, none of them organized his book according to the standard classical pattern, all of them abandoned the inventional schemes of status and topics. Faculty psychology, literary concepts of genius and taste, the identification of rhetoric with belles lettres—all these movements were afoot in eighteenth-century English rhetoric and permeated Channing's theory and teaching. Furthermore, Channing was strongly influenced by the Common Sense doctrine.[51]

Channing's changes in the concept of rhetoric cannot be explained exclusively in terms of British influence. His own primary interest in literature was also a factor. In devoting almost a fourth of his public lectures to literary criticism he had precedent in Blair, but not in Campbell or Whately. He could have assigned his sophomores book I of Campbell instead of just those parts relating to style. Nothing in Campbell or Whately inspired him to assign his students a preponderance of literary topics for themes. His occasional evening meetings in his study with students need not have been devoted to reading poets and novelists; they could have been spent studying political orations or rhetorical theory. Because of his own interests, Channing seriously weakened rhetoric's classic relation to politics. Perhaps *Harvard* and *Alumnus* had been right, after all.

7.

The literary concerns which Channing brought to the Boylston professorship never disappeared. Indeed, the trend to literary criticism became more pronounced during the tenure of Francis James Child, who was graduated as head of the class of 1846 and served as Channing's assistant from 1848 to 1850. It was, however, a different type of literary study, for Child was influenced profoundly by German scholarship, which he imbibed at Göttingen before succeeding to the Boylston professorship in 1851.[52]

Child found academic life in Germany radically different from that in his homeland. Instead of giving marks for schoolboy recitations, the German professor lectured or used the seminar

[48] Barber, a disciple of Joshua Steele, came to America in 1823, taught elocution at Yale, wrote an elocution manual and taught at Harvard from 1830 to 1835. His bamboo wheel was the butt of many jokes, the ultimate indignity being its suspension on a barber's pole opposite the college yard.

[49] For a discussion of British thought in America, see Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought*, 2nd. ed. (New York, 1951), pp. 233ff.

[50] Douglas Ehninger, "Campbell, Blair, and Whately: Old Friends in a New Light," *Western Speech*, XIX (October 1955), 263-9.

[51] Richard H. Dana, Jr., "Biographical Notice," in Channing, pp. xv-xvi.

[52] There is no definitive biography of Child, but biographical details can be found in the following: "Francis James Child," *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, V (December 1896), 209-10; C. E. Norton, "Francis James Child," *ibid.*, VI (December 1897), 161-9; Gamaliel Bradford, "Francis James Child," *Atlantic Monthly*, CXXXII (July 1923), 76-86.

method. Whereas the American student took a prescribed course of study, the Germans extended their ideal of Academic Freedom to the student, so that an unrestricted elective system prevailed. The American professor was almost exclusively a teacher; his German counterpart was a productive scholar. The Americans settled for a little knowledge; "A German scholar," as one German-trained American Ph.D. wrote, "sits and smokes and drinks coffee, and studies his sixteen hours a day, partly because it feels good."[53] The lecture and seminar methods, the elective system, the concept of research and productive scholarship, the Ph.D. degree—all these are integral to American universities today, but they were new to Child's generation.[54]

The German approach to rhetoric and literature was substantially different from Harvard's. As early as the mid-seventeenth century, the German universities had begun to abandon Latin Humanism for a new type of Humanism. "Latin poetry and eloquence," Paulsen writes of the period, "were now as much despised as outward scholastic plunder by the 'moderns,' with Thomasius at their head, as the philosophy and theology of pseudo-philosophers and theologians had been two centuries before."[55] German scholarship soon thereafter abandoned the study of composition—written or spoken—and became preoccupied with criticism. Thus, Child was immersed in an environment which had a long tradition of criticism, but not of composition.

German criticism did not ignore classical rhetoric and oratory, though it approached the subject as it did everything else—with a heavy-handed factual, "scientific," philological emphasis. But Child became more enchanted with its researches in early English linguistics and literature.

Child returned to America inspired with German ideals of scholarship. He believed passionately in the concept of research, as one of Albert Bushnell Hart's reminiscences illustrates: "Francis James Child used to say with a disarming twinkle that the University would never be perfect until we got rid of all the students. This was a hint at one of the strongest and most beneficent duties of the modern university, namely, to contribute to the world's stock of knowledge."[56] Putting his ideal into practice, Child acquired an international reputation for his researches on Chaucer and Spenser and his collections of Scottish and English ballads.

Because Child was one of the first American scholars to be trained in Germany, he occupied for many years an academically lonely position. René Wellek credits him with being the only productive scholar in the modern languages in the United States during the 1850's.[57] With only limited support from other faculty members, his attempts to introduce advanced literary and linguistic studies were frustrated, just as the larger

[53] Edward Everett, MS Diary, December 15, 1815; Everett Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

[54] Among the numerous works which discuss the profound influence of German universities on American ones are the following: Charles Franklin Thwing, *The American and the German University, One Hundred Years of History* (New York, 1928); Abraham Flexner, *Universities: American, English, German* (New York, 1930); John A. Walz, *German Influence in American Education and Culture* (Philadelphia, 1936).

[55] Friedrich Paulsen, *The German Universities and University Study*, trans. Frank Thilly and William W. Elwang (New York, 1906), pp. 40-1.

[56] "Ten Years of Harvard," *Harvard Graduates Magazine*, XI (September 1902), 64.

[57] "Literary Scholarship," *American Scholarship in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Merle Curti (Cambridge, 1953), p. 111.

movement to introduce German methods was blocked time and again.

Perhaps because of these frustrations, the work of listening to declamations and correcting themes grew increasingly distasteful. Knowing that the German universities did not bother with such "elementary" things, he came to question their academic validity. "Declamation," he wrote a friend, "we (I and a majority of the Faculty) utterly disapprove. We consider it pernicious, and the abandonment of it as an 'advance' in the teaching of oratory, if," he added significantly, "such teaching is attempted." Themes, he concluded, deserve no more attention.[58] Writing of Child's years as Boylston professor, Barrett Wendell, a long-time colleague, wrote: "This work, as is well known, he never found congenial; and, whatever the opinions with which he began it, he certainly relinquished it with grave doubts of its usefulness in the higher education."[59]

Regardless of his wishes, Child was obliged to continue the professorship along somewhat traditional lines. The public lectures continued to be required, and students continued to deliver declamations and to write themes. As in Channing's time, the sophomores studied Campbell while the juniors and seniors read Whately's *Logic* and *Rhetoric*.

However, Child made some substantial philological inroads into rhetoric's domain. The public lectures, which he entitled "English Language and Literature," completely ignored rhetoric in preference to linguistics and criticism. "I do not know that I can do anything better at present," he wrote a friend while preparing them, "than to select the age of Chaucer for my main subject & to group around old Jeffry & his time what I may have to say of earlier poetry."[60]

Child also introduced some linguistics and literature, especially the study of Anglo-Saxon, into the sophomore year, although that class continued to study Campbell. Limited success was achieved in getting languages taught as an elective. The Harvard *Catalogue* for 1853-54 announced that "The Gothic and Anglo-Sax Languages are taught (to those who desire to learn them), by Professor Child." Finally, in 1867, a credit-bearing elective course in Anglo-Saxon was authorized.

Child's victory over rhetoric came into sight in 1869, when Charles William Eliot became president of Harvard. During Eliot's presidency the ever-increasing pressures for change finally broke down all resistance and within twenty years Harvard resembled a German university more than the Harvard of Channing's time. A system of formal courses was established and in its wake came the elective system. "In 1874-75," Morison records, "President Eliot could announce that all required studies were now in Freshman year, except a few odd bits of Rhetoric, History, Philosophy, and Political Economy."[61] In 1883, the elective system was extended to the freshman year and "the President announced the 'practical completion of a

[58] F. J. Child to Richard H. Dana, Jr., Cambridge, Feb. 22, 1874; Dana Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society. In the same letter, Child indicated that he not only discouraged the Boylston declamations, but also attended against his will.

[59] Signed letter in Boston *Evening Transcript*, September 17, 1896; clipping in Francis James Child: A selection of press cuttings &c., Harvard Archives.

[60] F. J. [Child] to Charles [E. Norton], Cambridge, Sept. 28, 1851; Norton Papers, Houghton Library.

[61] "Introduction," *The Development of Harvard University since the Inauguration of President Eliot, 1869-1929*, ed. Samuel Eliot Morison (Cambridge, 1930), pp. xlii-xliii.

development which began sixty years ago.' There were now no required courses save Freshman English and German (or French), Sophomore and Junior themes and forensics, and two easy half-year lecture courses, one on Chemistry and one on Physics."[62]

The rise of the system of courses resulted in some structural changes in the Boylston professorship. The public lectures were abandoned, inasmuch as all material was transmitted to students in "courses." "Rhetoric" and "elocution" became separate course titles, although they were given by the same department. Thus, Channing's partial abandonment of delivery to his assistant was now completed. Delivery was no longer part of rhetoric.

Eliot's strongly-held belief in the elective system was tempered by his belief in the importance of teaching students to express themselves clearly and effectively. In his famous *Atlantic* papers, written shortly before his election to the presidency, he wrote of the new scientific education:

> No men have greater need of the power of expressing their ideas with clearness, conciseness, and vigor than those whose avocations require them to describe and discuss material resources, industrial processes, public works, mining enterprises, and the complicated problems of trade and finance. In such writings embellishment may be dispensed with, but the chief merits of style—precision, simplicity, perspicuity, and force—are never more necessary.[63]

All education should include "training in the power of expression—in clear, concise exposition, and in argument, or the logical setting forth of a process of reasoning."[64] Eliot, therefore, never permitted rhetoric to become an elective, though the advanced courses and elocution eventually lost their prescribed status.

Yet Eliot was sympathetic with Child's desire to introduce critical literary studies. In 1870, only a year after Eliot's inauguration, John Richard Dennett was made Assistant Professor of Rhetoric in order to give Child time for literature courses. Dennett was later replaced by Adams Sherman Hill, a Harvard graduate of 1853 and a lawyer-turned-journalist.[65]

A few years later, in 1876, Child was offered a professorship at The Johns Hopkins University, which began operation that same year. Johns Hopkins, the first American university founded on the German model, emphasized graduate study and productive scholarship. It would have been an excellent place for Child; but personal considerations as well as Eliot's reforms kept him at Harvard. The offer, however, was credited by Child with motivating Harvard to relieve him entirely of work in rhetoric.[66] The new arrangement was formalized by his being made "Professor of English"—the first such title at Harvard—and Hill's being promoted to the Boylston professorship.

Basically, Child did not change the concept of rhetoric. He simply avoided the subject as much as possible; and in the process he laid the foundations for the Department of English.

8.

Hill preserved the status quo for a short time. Elocution remained outside

[62] *Ibid.*, p. xliii.

[63] "The New Education, Its Organization—II," *Atlantic Monthly*, XXIII (March 1869), 359.

[64] Charles William Eliot, *Educational Reforms, Essays and Addresses* (New York, 1898), pp. 321-2.

[65] Very little readily-available biographical data on Hill exist. The most complete is "Adams Sherman Hill," *Report of the Harvard Class of 1853* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 135-141.

[66] John C. French, *A History of the University Founded by Johns Hopkins* (Baltimore, 1946), p. 89; Henry James, *Charles W. Eliot* (Boston, 1930), II, 14-5.

his realm. The sophomores continued to study part of Campbell and some English literature while the advanced classes read Whately. Themes and declamations continued.

Changes, however, were not long in coming. One was the incorporation of rhetoric into a new Department of English. The establishment of formal departments resulted from increasing specialization, enlarged course offerings, and a larger student body and staff. The courses taught by Child, Hill, and the elocutionist were considered closely enough related to be under one department. The name "English" was apt, inasmuch as either "rhetoric," "composition," "philology," "linguistics," or "literature" would have described only part of the department's work.

Partially as a result of the departmental name, the term "rhetoric" fell out of fashion. The old rhetoric courses came to be called "composition and rhetoric," "composition," or simply "English." The word "rhetoric," when used at all, eventually became limited to the required beginning course.

There was also considerable shifting of requirements. The sophomore course was put on the freshman level and the advanced courses reduced correspondingly. As the elective system obtained a firmer grip on the college, the two advanced courses were reduced to half-year requirements and ultimately were made electives. At the same time, as the number of courses offered by the college expanded, additional composition electives were added, including, in 1878, one in oral discussion for seniors.

The most significant change was rhetoric's abandonment of oratory. The advanced courses, commonly known during this period as "themes and forensics," consisted almost exclusively of written work. Writing in 1894, Barrett Wendell, who had joined the faculty as Hill's assistant in 1880, described the courses as follows:

> In the half-course prescribed for Sophomores, lectures are given on Exposition, Argument, Description, and Narration; and during the year the students write twelve themes, of from five hundred to a thousand words. These are carefully criticised by teachers, and generally rewritten by the students, with this criticism in mind. In the half-course prescribed for Juniors there are lectures on Argument; and the students make one formal analysis of a masterpiece of argumentative composition, and write four arguments—known as "forensics"—of from a thousand to fifteen hundred words. Each of these is preceded by a brief, which is criticised by a teacher before the forensic is written. The forensics themselves are also carefully criticised, and frequently rewritten. All teachers engaged in these courses keep frequent office hours for personal conference with their pupils.[67]

The beginning course, too, gave much practice in writing, none in public speaking:

> Lectures based . . . [on the text] are given, and also lectures dealing with some aspects of English Literature. Of these lectures students are required to write summaries. Besides this written work, every member of the class writes a composition in the class-room once a week; and these compositions are carefully criticised by the teachers.[68]

The reasons for rhetoric's abandonment of oratory were numerous. Perhaps one was Hill's interests; for he came to Harvard after almost two decades as a journalist. Second, Eliot's reforms, based on a radically new concept of education, brought a new type of student to the university. The first three Boylston professors taught in an age when almost every student was destined for one of two professions—the ministry or law, both of which involved the practice of public speaking. But the new

[67] "English at Harvard," *The Dial*, XVI (March 1, 1894), 131-2.
[68] *Ibid.*, p. 131.

trends, begun during Child's term and brought to completion during Hill's, brought budding chemists and physicians, engineers and technicians, businessmen and administrators, scholars and poets to the university. Many of these students would never give a speech in their lives. Students and faculty alike came increasingly to look upon composition as nothing more than a tool for help in getting through college; and, as the authors of the famous report of the overseers' committee on composition and rhetoric pointed out, writing became increasingly important to the student:

> About the year 1870 a change began to make itself felt, first in numbers and then in the methods of the college, which gradually brought about what amounted to a revolution. The classes increased in size nearly fourfold, so as to become wholly unmanageable for oral recitation, and the elective system was greatly enlarged; step by step, the oral method of instruction was then abandoned, and a system of lectures, with periodic written examinations, took its place; so that at last the whole college work was practically done in writing. The need of facility in written expression was, of course, correspondingly increased. Without the power of writing his mother tongue readily and legibly, a college student was not equipped for the work he had to do, inasmuch as he did not have at his control an implement essential for doing that work.[69]

Even law and the ministry were undergoing changes which minimized the importance of oratorical ability. Law began to specialize, so that not all lawyers appeared in court to plead cases. Although no analagous change took place in the ministry, the German influence inspired new scholarly interests in such matters as ecclesiastical history and Biblical criticism, which occupied much of the future minister's time.

Finally, American society generally was less interested in oratory than it had been in ante-bellum days. It is beyond the scope of this paper to analyze the reasons; but the decline was a fact. Conversely, increasing mass literacy and a flood of popular magazines and newspapers increased the importance of the written word.

These factors influenced not only the curriculum-makers and teachers, but also the students. George Pierce Baker, a student in the early 1880's and later a member of the faculty, testifies that there was a notable lack of student interest in public speaking during that decade. It was not until the advent of intercollegiate debate during the 1890's that interest in speaking revived and several courses in oral argumentation and debate were added to the curriculum at the request of students. Significantly, however, rhetoric had become so identified with writing that the new speech courses were neither called "rhetoric" nor made part of the Boylston professor's work. Instead, they were under Baker's jurisdiction.[70]

An equally profound change concerned the nature and pedagogical role of rhetorical theory. Its role was minimized, especially in the advanced courses, where textbooks were eventually abandoned. The underlying pedagogical principle was that a combination of practice and criticism, not theory, was the best way to learn to write. This view was explicitly acknowledged by Wendell: "In the courses in Composition, prescribed and elective alike, little importance is attached to theoretical knowledge of rhetoric as distinguished from constant practice in writ-

[69] Charles Francis Adams, E. L. Godkin, George R. Nutter, "Final Report on English Composition," *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, VI (December 1897), 201.

[70] See George P. Baker, "Debating at Harvard," *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, VII (March 1899), esp. p. 363.

ing under the most minute practicable criticism. . . . It will be seen . . . that the use of text-books, as distinguished from personal instruction, is reduced to a minimum."[71] In the beginning course, there continued to be a text; but in 1878, Campbell was replaced by Adam Sherman Hill's own simplified *Principles of Rhetoric*.[72] Emphasis was on practice.

Another reason for the de-emphasis of theory was acceptance of the belief that students would learn much about composition by the study of literature. The study of literature in the freshman course, however, was not a return to the classical concept of imitation. On the contrary, Hill opposed imitation, per se, because "the best part of a good style is incommunicable."[73] "One may, however, get good from a master of English by unconscious absorption," he continued, "as one acquires good manners by associating with gentlemen and ladies."[74]

Changes in pedagogical ideas about the importance of theory in relation to practice and literature were no more significant than changes in the nature of the theory itself. Although Hill's text was not original (indeed, it was eclectic, drawing on classical doctrines, Channing's definition of rhetoric, Herbert Spencer's principle of economy of style, Whately's concepts of argumentation, and Campbell's principles of style —to name only some of the more important sources), his selection of concepts, the emphasis he gave them, and his special method of organizing and simplifying them changed substantially the nature of rhetorical theory.

Defining rhetoric as "the art of efficient communication by language,"[75] Hill divided his text into two parts, "Composition in General" and "Kinds of Composition." The first part was divided into two books, the first on "Grammatical Purity." "The foundations of rhetoric," he wrote, "rest upon grammar; for grammatical purity is a requisite of good writing."[76] The test of purity was present use, not the origin of the language. Hill adopted Campbell's three rules of purity—precision, simplicity, and euphony—and devoted many pages to violations of good usage —barbarisms, improprieties, solecisms.

The second book, "Rhetorical Excellence," was devoted largely to style, one chapter being devoted to "Choice of Words" and another to "Number of Words." The final chapter, "Arrangement," considered the arrangement of words in sentences, sentences in paragraphs, and paragraphs in whole compositions. The same principles of clearness, force, and ease were applied to all levels of arrangement.

The second part of Hill's text, "Kinds of Composition," was divided into description, narration, exposition, and argument.

Compared to earlier rhetorical theory, the book contained many unique features. First, whereas rhetoric had previously more or less presupposed grammar, Hill made grammar a major part of rhetoric. Somewhat given to pedantry, Hill, the "high priest of correctness and conformity to good usage,"[77] turned grammatical correctness into an ideal of composition—almost to the exclusion of other considerations.

[71] Wendell, p. 132.
[72] New York, 1878.
[73] Adams Sherman Hill, *Our English* (New York, 1888), p. 61.
[74] *Ibid.*, p. 62.
[75] Hill, *The Principles of Rhetoric*, p. v. This and subsequent quotations are from the second edition (1895).
[76] *Ibid.*, p. 1.
[77] Charles H. Grandgent, "The Modern Languages," Morison, p. 76.

Second, invention was completely abandoned. Channing had objected merely to inventional schemes, not invention, per se; but Hill explicitly excluded the most important branch of classical rhetoric: "the function of rhetoric is not to provide the student of composition with materials for thought . . . but to stimulate and train his powers of expression."[78]

Third, although Hill gave more attention to arrangement than Channing had, the application of the same general principles of clearness, force, and ease to all levels of arrangement blended *dispositio* with *elocutio*. Furthermore, very little attention was given to arrangement of the whole composition.

Fourth, the division of compositions into exposition, narration, description, and argument preserved Channing's broad definition of rhetoric while at the same time giving students more detailed instructions on composing each type than Channing's students had received.

Of particular interest is Hill's treatment of argument and persuasion; for it was far removed from that envisioned by the original statutes. The word "argument" was considered the broader term, and Hill's discussion of it, no doubt influenced by Whately, revolved around such concepts as presumption, burden of proof, evidence, and types of reasoning. "Persuasion" was restricted to appeals to the feelings; it was a useful "adjunct" to argument inasmuch as conviction (produced by argument) was sometimes insufficient to influence the will.

Hill's brief discussion of persuasion is a clear example of his reorganization and simplification of older doctrines. He reduced persuasion to five principles: (1) concreteness, (2) reserved force (Spencer's principle of economy), (3) climax, (4) variety, (5) adaptation. He also discussed the exordium and peroration and devoted a short special section to simplicity and sincerity.

Finally, the over-all tone of dogmatism which pervaded Hill's book was unlike that of any of his predecessors'. He reduced rhetoric to lists of principles and rules, set forth *ex cathedra*.

Various factors brought about these changes. Albert Kitzhaber, in an excellent discussion of the leading texts of this period, related the dogmatic tone of Hill's book to his personality. Hill seems not to have been a popular teacher and had a reputation as a dogmatic and biting theme-critic.[79]

Second, the intellectual life of the period was dominated by interest in science. Darwinism was the talk of the day, science courses were receiving considerable attention in the curriculum, the president of Harvard was a chemist, even literary scholarship was interested primarily in "scientific," philological fact-finding. Curiously, this scientific environment did not prompt rhetoric to emphasize its investigative and analytical aspects. But it is not curious that in an age when scientists talked of the "fundamental laws of nature," a rhetorician—even one who insisted that rhetoric was an art, not a science—would seek to reduce rhetoric to a few fundamental "rules." Nor is it curious that scientists often over-estimated man's rationality, thereby creating an atmosphere more conducive to Whately's concepts of logical argument than to its "adjunct," persuasion.

Finally, rhetoric's immediate environment—the Department of English—needs to be considered. As enrollment

[78] Hill, *Principles*, p. vi.

[79] Albert Raymond Kitzhaber, Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900 (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Washington, 1953), pp. 98ff.

increased, Hill's staff was enlarged; but the dividing line between composition and literature was increasingly blurred, so that it eventually disappeared. Hill himself taught several literature courses later in his career. With few exceptions, the new English teachers were more interested in literature than in traditional rhetoric. Small wonder that the literary forms of composition, description and narration, received attention at the expense of persuasion. Furthermore, the philological orientation of literary scholarship made it natural for rhetoric to concern itself with pedantic details of grammatical correctness at the expense of traditional rhetoric.

9.

Rhetoric's place in the university became increasingly insecure. Most English professors considered it a distraction from literary scholarship.

The sharpest attack came from a special committee of the overseers. After examining a mass of student themes, it pronounced them intolerable and, taking note of the tremendous amount of faculty time being expended on correcting simple grammatical errors, recommended that the dismal business of teaching fundamentals of composition be relegated to the high schools. If composition is to be taught in college, it concluded, let it be as an advanced elective.[80]

Yet rhetoric survived. In 1894, Wendell reported that of the nine full courses offered by the department, three were in composition; of the seventeen half-courses, four were in composition. In addition, elocution and oral discussion were available.[81] Within a few years after Wendell's report, several debate courses were inaugurated. When Bliss Perry joined the Harvard faculty in 1906, he was impressed—and, despite his earlier career as a teacher of oratory, somewhat puzzled—by the persistent faith in the value of composition courses.[82]

10.

By 1904, when Hill retired, the old endowed professorships were no longer independent departments; the university had grown too large for that. They were positions of honor, with old titles being maintained for tradition's sake, not because they necessarily described accurately the work of the professor.

LeBaron Russell Briggs was elected as Hill's successor. As an older, well-established professor, he taught advanced work, his main interest being literary composition on the graduate level. Thus the final proceedings were completed in the divorce of rhetoric and oratory from the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory.

11.

The history of the Boylston professorship might be summarized in terms of three influences: classical, English, German. The latter, coupled with the trend toward practical education, revolutionized the entire university in such a way that traditional rhetoric was thought to have little place in the curriculum. Philology flourished, rhetoric decayed.

These same trends occurred to a greater or lesser degree in all of American higher education. Thus, rhetoric underwent a marked decline, one which has been partially reversed only in the twentieth century. But although rhetoric declined, it served as the basis for departments in English language and literature.

[80] Adams, Godkin, Nutter, esp. 207ff.
[81] Wendell, p. 131.
[82] *And Gladly Teach* (Boston, 1935), pp. 253-4.

READERS OR RHAPSODES?

Hugh Dickinson

THE nation-wide tours of Emlyn Williams in *A Boy Growing Up* and Sir John Gielgud in *The Ages of Man* have met with such success, critical and popular, that they may well have an important effect on interpretation as public performance. Certainly they represent outstanding examples of that phase of interpretation which might be said to have begun with the post-war readings of Charles Laughton. These three men—established actors, rather than interpreters, and all British-born and British-trained—have implanted in the public mind a certain conception of interpretation that may come to serve, both in competency and technique, as a standard of performance. If this view obtains, will it be a good thing for interpretation generally to be measured by such a standard of public reading?

Williams is by now a veteran, but Gielgud's tour was his debut in public readings. Sir John's program of scenes and sonnets from Shakespeare achieved a loose thematic unity by following the pattern of Jaques' Seven Ages of Man. The selection and treatment of material were traditional. In that respect, the Williams program was the more interesting, since it was the more experimental. It dealt with material that was both contemporary and largely new to the public platform, consisting entirely of autobiographical stories and sketches by Dylan Thomas which begin with the author as a very small boy in Wales and end with his adventures as a young dog in Bohemian London. Surprisingly, in view of Thomas' vogue as poet and reader of his own poetry, the selections contained almost no verse. Taken together, the programs treated the genres of lyric and dramatic poetry and prose narrative.

As one would expect, the work of Gielgud and Williams is, like Laughton's, thoroughly professional in approach and very highly skilled in execution. No one who has heard either is likely to question their authority and finish. They take stage with firm address and, with minor exceptions, perform with clarity of intention. One may not like what these performers do, but one would be hard put to it to show that it was ill done. We should, however, examine what it is they do—without assuming unwisely that they do the same thing—before considering the import of their success for modern interpretation.

Although there were striking differences between *A Boy Growing Up* and the Dickens readings Williams gave several years ago, the modern material easily rivalled the older for suitability and exceeded it in general audience appeal. Dylan Thomas is more readily "available" than Dickens to a modern American audience. The appointments of the Dylan Thomas program were less obviously theatrical (though just as shrewdly chosen) than those of the Dickens programs with their mesmeric lighting-effects and with Williams costumed and made up as the great novelist

Mr. Dickinson (M.F.A., Yale, 1949) is Associate Professor in Speech and Drama at Loyola University, Chicago.

reading his own works at a replica of his red-plush reading-stand. Now there was only a chair, backed by a white screen with Dylan Thomas' signature on it to focus the eye. Williams appeared in business dress, holding an armful of worn copybooks, to interpret the author's recollections of his childhood. The earlier programs had employed the convention of the author-as-reader: the courtly and assured figure of Dickens had not been characterized for us, but rather presented as a mask, impersonal and distant, through whom the stories came to us. The author-as-reader addressed no word to the audience that did not come from the pages of the book he held, and he stayed always outside his own works.

This time, Williams briefly addressed the audience in his own person, then made a deft transition to a new convention: the author-as-memorialist. Dylan Thomas existed only as a fictional character who spoke from within his stories, and they became reveries that the audience overheard. The author stood within the world of his fiction as he recalled his past, never outside it. The focus of action was almost always the middle distance, and the presence of the audience was not acknowledged. As a technical device, the convention succeeded admirably: one adjusted to it easily, and promptly forgot it. But a definite, although subtle, distinction was achieved. A composite self-portrait of the author emerged gradually from the stories, without the least attempt on Williams' part to imitate the voice, appearance, or manner—so well known—of the literary lion so recently dead. The portrait bore no relation to the large, tousled, over-publicized poet; and it was absolutely convincing. This, even more than the vivid and telling techniques with which individual effects were handled, convinced me that the works were being *interpreted*.

I mean by this that it is difficult, even now, to approach Dylan Thomas' works without preconceptions: one has to try to dispel the smog of literary gossip and of gamey memoirs, to expunge the quite adventitious picture of the writer as a sick and dying man. Under the circumstances, any literal imitation would have bordered on sensationalism. Williams avoided it entirely. His power to dominate the imagination of the audience was proved in his ability to create and impose a valid literary portrait derived from the works alone. The result was that the writings stood forth entrancingly, fresh and clear and freed of all unsavory and irrelevant associations. This is, of course, a tribute to Thomas' work: it is equally a tribute to his countryman's tact and good taste and interpretative insight—virtues as positive in a reader as are selection and arrangement in a writer. It is cause for deep gratitude that Williams could supplant the public image of the *artist* by the portrait of the *man* contained in his works.

If memory serves, there was in Williams' program only one instance of confusion of effect. This occurred during the reading of that story-within-a-story, "Like Little Dogs." As the central character began to tell his woes to the author, Williams moved from center stage to another area, turned up his coat collar, and stood in a shaft of light on the now-darkened stage. Placement of the narration definitely shifted from the middle distance to "on stage." The obscurity seems to be in the action, traceable to the writing; but Williams' interpretation, and reliance upon stage picture, did nothing to clarify it.

Williams is a highly disciplined technician whose glance, gesture, intonation, and timing do not vary perceptibly from one performance to the next. And *A Boy Growing Up* had been thoroughly tested in a London run before he brought it to the United States. It was all the more interesting, therefore, to see so practiced an actor fail to prevent or "step on" ill-timed applause that drowned out a carefully planned final effect. Moreover, he persisted in using the device despite its failure. His intent was to make his final exit while reciting the lines of the poem already referred to, and so to time it that the refrain, "And death shall have no dominion," should be twice spoken from the wings while the audience looked at the empty chair, the copybooks, and the monogrammed screen standing in a beam of white light. But he could not make the poem persist beyond the moment of his disappearance into the wings.

When he took his final curtain call, Williams directed applause to the monogrammed screen; just as earlier, at the end of his Dickens readings, he directed applause to the reading stand. This modest gesture of giving credit where ultimately credit is due, is nicely calculated showmanship, for it invariably produces the loudest applause of all, and so brings the performance to a climactic close. But it is showmanship which is completely justified: Williams subordinates himself to the text and its intent; he serves the author brilliantly.

He uses stage areas, effect-lighting, posture and gesture and business—all meagerly. Yet some will undoubtedly insist that what he does is not interpretation, but acting. Aside from the fact that prose narrative does not lend itself readily to acting because of a conflict of genres, this objection may have some weight. One's only recourse, then, is to locate the main source of the images which one carries away from the performance.

One can recall "Dylan Thomas" astride a chair, or as a small boy looking up at, or through the legs of, huge, grown-up picnickers; or in his daydreams flying exuberantly over town and down and sea, an exhilarating sense of flight and freedom being reinforced through body movement and facial expression; or recall the pitiful brother of "Like Little Dogs," standing under a street lamp; or a weird Bohemian conducting a conversation while bouncing about on mattresses as on a trampoline. These *visual* images came from the interpreter's business or his stage picture. It was the *verbal* images—the stories themselves, with the people, actions, and sights they describe—that provided the source of one's enjoyment. What was most memorable was achieved by words. Therefore, can one perhaps conclude that what was so entertaining is not acting, but interpretation?

The same aesthetic question may, however, be raised about some of Gielgud's work; and yet, ironically, you will find no more laudatory review of it than that by Harold Clurman which emphatically states that it was not acting, but reading:

> Gielgud is an actor of high rank, but his readings are *readings:* they are not acting. By themselves they are certainly not theatre. This became particularly apparent to me as I listened to a speech from *Measure for Measure.* I had seen Gielgud as Angelo in this play some years ago at Stratford-on-Avon and was much impressed by the insidious, worm-eaten, crabbed "medievalism"—half anguished conscience, half sadistic hypocrisy—which informed his impersonation. In the reading only the verbal sense and the inspiration of language

were communicated. . . . Gielgud's reading is thin compared to his acting at its best.[1]

It is refreshing for a change, if nothing more, to hear a theatrical director rejecting as interpretation what theorists of interpretation might well repudiate as acting! The most rigid theorist would not find fault with Gielgud's reading of the sonnets and "The Passionate Pilgrim," except for a few slight stumbles; but he might find the handling of the scenes from the plays something else again. The passages read were all dramatic monologs; no scenes with two or more characters speaking were attempted. Book and stand were on the platform, as a convention of the reading performance; but Gielgud referred to them only during his brief commentaries—almost never during the readings proper. At times he moved about, employed business, and placed the action of the scene "on stage." When he performed Hotspur's "pouncet-box speech," for instance, he placed king and court downstage right, and moved nervously about, gesturing freely. Similarly, Benedick's speech on marriage was spoken to invisible companions also placed "on stage," rather than in the realm of the audience. The sense of the presence of other characters was not strong; which is perhaps to say that the spatial was not emphasized over the verbal. Lear's dying speech, on the other hand, was placed in the realm of the audience, resulting in an increase in one's sense of involvement in the action. As to the degree of impersonation used, Sir John himself would seem to agree with Clurman that it was far below what would have been employed in acting the various roles. He considers himself too old to play Romeo, yet he had no hesitation in reading from the part; and in this connection he told Henry Hewes: "What I do is not really perform it but to indicate how I feel it ought to be played."[2]

Even if the degree of impersonation is considered acceptable for true interpretation, the occasional use of "on stage" focus constitutes, in the light of interpretative theory, a "mixing" of acting and interpretation that is aesthetically inconsistent:

> In interpretation . . . Our scene is always established in the realm of the audience, as if we saw the characters moving there. . . . [Anything else] breaks all of the "unities" either of place, scene, or mood in the narration. The interpreter in narration should never become actor, nor bring his "scene" back to the acting realm, close to him "on-stage." *There are no exceptions.* [Author's emphasis.][3]

Although the reference is specifically to narrative, it would seem that it must apply with at least equal rigor to the interpretation of drama, where there is not the difference of genre provided by narrative to help keep the type of performance distinct.

No one wishes to regard interpretation simply as flawed or deficient acting; to judge Gielgud's work as acting would be, according to Clurman, "deplorable aesthetics," and could only result in a verdict of woeful inadequacy. How are we to escape from the critical dilemma? A possible answer has been hinted at in the use of "visual images" and "verbal images" as contrasted terms, and Clurman's aesthetic of theatre (which, in this context, can be understood as synonymous with acting) may be helpful in providing a workable viewpoint without committing one to all its tenets.

[1] "Theatre," *The Nation*, CLXXXVIII (10 January 1959), 39-40.

[2] "Broadway Postscript," *The Saturday Review* (27 December 1958), p. 20.

[3] This is the view of Gertrude E. Johnson in "Impersonation, a Necessary Technique" in Gertrude E. Johnson, ed., *Studies in the Art of Interpretation* (New York, 1940), p. 129.

For him, theatre is rooted in the *visual:* "It means that in the beginning [of the theatre] was not the word."[4] It follows that acting is not *primarily* related to words at all: "Words are gestures—gestures of the spirit and the body in one organic whole of action."[5] It further follows that good acting must have *its own content.* Thus it must never be merely illustrative or interpretive of the word. (He could regard the Old Vic productions of the 1958-1959 season as "hardly more than illustrated readings—most charmingly illustrated in *Twelfth Night*—more meagerly in *Hamlet* and *Henry V.*")[6]

Using such an approach, one can regard acting and interpretation as belonging to the same continuum—that of performance, and therefore to be distinguished on the basis of their *primary* appeals: acting as *largely* visual, interpretation as *largely* aural. As performance, they may be regarded as different in degree, rather than in kind. The possible distinctions between them will be matters of emphasis, rather than of clear-cut, hard-and-fast definition—ultimately referable to the literary genre to be served, as the determining factor.

Either practically or schematically, it is not possible—nor does it seem desirable—to set the visual and the aural at exact extremes of performance. We can, of course, imagine acting that is entirely visual, as in pure pantomime; but we cannot really imagine interpretation that is entirely aural in its appeal; and so the statement of primary appeals must be made in qualified terms. Apart from its mechanical reproduction on radio or phonograph, voice does not exist alone, either in nature or in art; unless the interpreter is hidden or the audience blind, voice cannot be separated from body. The aural aspect of interpretation was stressed by W. J. Friedrich in his paper, "What Is Interpretation?" delivered in December 1957, at the Central States Speech Association Conference in Chicago:

> Aside from minor helps from facial expression and muscular tonus, the voice and the brain of the reader are the media for this stimulation of the listener. For this reason the good reader is almost always as effective when not seen as when seen: witness the power of recordings and radio readings. In fact, with certain types of materials—and readers—the unseen reader may be even more effective than the visible one, for he runs less chance of having personal mannerisms and facial and bodily distortions distract the listener.

Recordings and radio readings can be powerful; but, by their nature, they fall short of the ideal of *performance,* which is the reader in living contact with his audience. Voice and body are parts of the same continuum—that of the performer; and the performer is indivisible.

It follows that the aural and the visual belong together in interpretation. The teacher who holds that "it should all be done with the voice" is placing an emphasis, not laying down a rule that can actually be followed. But such an extreme emphasis imposes extreme constraint, as would the attempt to eliminate all dialog from acting. For one thing, the interpreter must, like any performer, dominate his audience. He does not do this with voice alone, or even with his material alone; but also with his physical presence, bearing, vitality, glance, and expression. At a public performance, the eyes of the au-

[4] "Theatre," *The Nation,* CLXXXVIII (24 January 1959), 76. Clurman develops his aesthetic in *Lies Like Truth: Theatre Reviews and Essays* (New York, 1958). See esp. "On Acting," pp. 242 *et seq.;* also pp. 4, 5, 140, 149-50, 157, and 259.

[5] In his review of Gielgud already quoted.

[6] *Ibid.*

dience, as well as their ears, are engaged —and for the same purpose. They look to the interpreter as to the organizer of their emotions and the purveyor of their understanding of the work. The visual focus which the interpreter provides has far more relevance to public performance than, for example, the presence of the conductor has to the work of his musicians at a symphony concert. Emlyn Williams' failure to suppress applause because he was not supposed to be visible to his listeners is a case very much in point.

The continuum of performance implies, of course, a middle ground where acting and interpretation may overlap and thus become—not indistinguishable, but examples of "poor" acting or "poor" reading. This would be the result of wrong emphasis, a confusion of intent toward the material and a corresponding confusion of effect, because neither is in proper relation to the genre being interpreted. Except by the most constrained vocal standards of interpretation, neither Williams nor Gielgud strayed into that middle ground. Both gave primacy to the word, and did so with taste and intelligence (if without regard for textbook consistency). Their technique assumed that the eye must also be engaged, if our response to what we hear is to be as total as the reader's should be to what he is reading.

When an art is in a healthy state, its professional practitioners are—as they should be—its standard of excellence. The contributions of Laughton, Williams, and Gielgud attest to the health of interpretation. Their standards of public performance are exceedingly high. We should look upon them, not uncritically, with well-earned respect.

* * *

MUSE TO MEDUSA: NOTES ON THE NEW YORK THEATRE, 1958-1959

Alan S. Downer

I once heard Professor Kitto, of Bristol, describe the dramatic cycle thus: "First there is the playwrights' theatre, then the actors' theatre, then the producers' [directors'] theatre." Three inevitable steps, so to speak, from Muse to Medusa. If it took the Athenians three centuries to complete the cycle, the Elizabethans eighty years, and Broadway three decades, this is only further evidence of American efficiency.
—William Bainbridge

The 1958-1959 season in New York produced among other things two documents of utmost importance to those future historians who may trouble themselves with the adventures of Thespis in mid-century America. The lesson of both is similar, though the materials are as far apart as Provincetown and Shubert Alley. The first is *The Seesaw Log* by William Gibson, the second the correspondence of Archibald MacLeish and Elia Kazan; and the lesson is that everyone on Broadway, with the possible exception of Elia Kazan, is running scared.

Gibson came to Broadway after some experience as a novelist and television writer, and his account of his adventures must stand beside Colley Cibber's as a monument to time-serving, though made up-to-date by a sense of guilt, or artistic moralizing, which mutes most of the exuberance of Cibber's account of his career of theatrical piracy. Gibson had written a play, *Two for the Seesaw*, about a transient love-affair between a wholly delightful, utterly independent Jewish dancer-dressmaker from the Bronx and a mid-western lawyer who was trying to recover from an unsatisfactory marriage in an over-cushioned environment. An amusing and unimportant little play, it was three years in the writing and a fourth in reaching its New York first night. Yet, barring certain modern licence as to what is actually displayed and discussed on the stage, the play was not much more than the sort of romance that Dion Boucicault used to grind out in a week or two for immediate production, with another on his desk if the first should fail.

The Seesaw Log tries to explain the long journey to the opening night. Gibson constantly fretted about the restrictions of dramatic form: since his heroine had captured his imagination (he declares he put most of his "internal life" into her), his hero seemed pale and one-dimensional; the search for an *exactly right* leading lady went on endlessly, and, since the eventual choice was an unknown actress, there was an equally long search for a male actor with a famous reputation. Yet the eventual "form" of the play was more epic than well-made, a series of scenes, like short stories, strung together on a Sabatiniesque chain of metropolitan sound effects to mask scene-changes and time lapses. The understudy for the eventually selected star was at least as skillful as the actress who was *exactly right*, and the role has been cast without dif-

Mr. Downer, Professor of English at Princeton, contributes his third annual essay on the Broadway season. He is chairman of the American Society for Theatre Research. His publications include especially The Art of the Play *(1956).*

ficulty in half-a-dozen continental reproductions.

It is too easy to blame the delays recorded in *The Seesaw Log* on economics, on the fear of financial failure. Naturally the commercial theatre expects to pay its way, it would be a fraud if it did not; but the commercial theatre is also a professional theatre, and Gibson reveals very clearly that the creative (as opposed to the recreative) members of the theatrical profession no longer know what they are about. Having written a script, they entrust it to producers, directors, actors, even hangers-on, eagerly listen to criticisms, eagerly seize advice and suggestions, and spend months in deleting, rewriting, and patching. They admit that they do not understand audiences as well as the professionals who have to face them nightly, and they are terrified of the dramatic critics who are, after all, members of the audience. In fact the only person connected with a production who may be said to be no longer a member of the audience is the playwright. He is an outsider—Gibson even admits trying to write his play as a novel—and to him the theatre is a maze, *terra incognita*, through which he treads with trembling hesitation. The playwright is no longer a "working stiff," and perhaps the physical theatre has become too complicated for, in Mr. Goldwyn's phrase, a mere "word man" to master. But along with this record of compromise there is an attitude of condescension that does not make pretty reading.

Lord Byron once wrote that good workmen never quarrel with their tools. Perhaps that should be modified to "with their medium" once they have chosen it. Byron was not calling for the artist to surrender to his tools, but to master them. The carpenter who runs scared is apt to be destroyed in the collapse of the house he is building.

The correspondence of Elia Kazan and Archibald MacLeish, published in *Esquire*, May 1959, concerns the Broadway production of *J.B.* Presumably, MacLeish in writing the play had known what he wanted to say, and as an experienced poet how he wanted to say it. At any rate, he had published the play as a finished work in 1958, and had seen it successfully performed by Yale University in that year. *J.B.* deals seriously with the greatest of all unanswerable questions, and MacLeish wisely chose a kind of ritual form as its vehicle; the core of the action, what happens to Job, is as remote and as immediate as the Mass, the characters are deliberately one-dimensional, their passions are rhetorical not intestinal, and Job's sores do not run. The answer to the question is also cast into a ritual image; the play owes nothing to Scribe, Ibsen, Chekhov, or O'Neill.

But ritual is not for Mr. Kazan. For him the theatre is a place of blood, sweat, and tears, of physical and emotional experience, and the play is an instrument for belaboring the audience until it is too exhausted to cry hold. He is a theatrical craftsman who can find uses for his tools that the inventors never dreamed of, and movement and speech, lights and properties, sounds (and very occasionally, silences) whip up a dramatic pudder reminiscent of the more hysterical excesses of Italian opera. However, Mr. Kazan does not intend merely to resurrect the meaningless tensions of nineteenth century melodrama. He is both a psychologist and social philosopher as he writes to MacLeish: "It's a play about the mid-century American, and mid-century America. The question you ask is: 'Will America be able to take it when it

comes?' I think the play should be staged so it says: 'Will you, the audience, be able to take it?'"

It cannot be denied that the Broadway *J.B.* put its audiences to the test. Mr. MacLeish's grave and universal pageant was replaced by Kazantics: The circus tent of the original was realized in a luminous canvas sheet hauled up from the stage floor and lighted from behind, showing how well our designers remember the lesson taught them by Robert Edmond Jones, that tawdry reality may also have great visual beauty. During a mimed prologue the stage was set in ominous silence by circus hands who were later to assume the minor roles called for by the script; this, if it was anything more than an economy measure, demanded an explanation not vouchsafed in the performance. The Job scenes, written with a kind of Unitarian spareness, were performed with the lushness of Method-ism, and Sarah was directed to writhe on the floor in agony of soul as her husband suffers the final indignity of skin disease. One of the visually thrilling moments supplied by the director was the destruction of the tent and circus ring by Mr. Nickles to mark the climax of Job's material misfortunes. This, together with the other pantomimic prologues (the frenzy of the armistice, the raucous clatter of a night club) and some startling sound effects (the devil's mask suddenly takes the very words out of his mouth) held the audience in a thrall of theatrical hypnosis which is Kazan's particular talent. But the audience was consequently badly prepared for the philosophical discourse which is the heart of the second half of the play, and Nickles and Zuss became even stranger at the fête than in the original script. Thus, an audience that may well have been concerned during the intermission with its ability to "take it when it comes," left the theatre at the end wondering whether it would make the last train to Greenwich. After all the brouhaha, the ending with its quiet, nostalgic, and very American image, was almost as anticlimactic as that of the Book of Job itself. Once again the audience had been subjected to the paradox that a success at the box-office was still a failure on the stage.

At a ceremonial presentation of annual awards later in the spring, Mr. MacLeish, clutching his citation, was heard to express his amazement that he should be included, along with the director and the producer. "In the theatre," he declared, "I have discovered that the author is the last to be heard from." It was Mr. Gibson's discovery, too; it is the inevitable discovery of the dramatist, professional or beginner, in the directors' theatre, the last stage of the dramatic cycle.

As is usual with artistic cycles, it lacks clear definition, and a new school of playwrights could alter the situation without causing agony to anyone, perhaps even including those directors who are the present masters of our dramatic fate. At least such playwrights as we have continue to supply scripts sufficiently tempting to the ingenuity of the directors to spare us the gimcrack revivals of the classics on which so many theatres must depend. In the main, Shakespeare has been keeping his distance during the last few years; his nearest approach to Broadway this season was in *Cue for Passion*, *Hamlet* rewritten by a playwright who obviously has run out of subject matter. Elmer Rice, in spite of certain famous gestures in the direction of fantasy and expressionism, has always been at heart a realist, and he presented a Hamlet so encumbered with scientific clichés that

the result was more case history than tragedy.

Rice has had some experience as a director, and he used a good deal of the modern director's ingenuity in bringing the ancient tragedy home to the contemporary audience. The scene is no longer Denmark but California (an acceptable substitute as an image of social and spiritual corruption?), Horatio is no longer Charles-his-friend but a criminal psychologist (a great help in explaining Mr. Rice's improvements to the unread in the audience), Polonius is a bumbling G.P., and Hamlet is very sorry to have killed him. The new Gertrude is a great advance on the old model. Not only has she murdered her first husband, but she is equally in love with her second and with her son; when "Claudius" suggests that he and Hamlet should run the family estate together, she replies that nothing could suit her better, and the enlightened in the audience nod their heads. But the new Hamlet is a disappointment. Since he never loved his father, he can only gag at him when he is confronted by his presence (in a drunken delirium, not as a ghost, a great advance in verisimilitude); he asks his mother to change his room since the wall which separates him from the marital chamber is very thin (Hamlet *voyeur*?); he sneers and hates, and talks sententiousness and threats. He is, in fact, the tiresome bore that all case histories become.

There is an old joke about an Irish troupe that played Shakespeare's tragedy, omitting by special request the part of Hamlet. If Mr. Rice has not actually omitted the character, he has omitted all the things that have made it eternally and universally attractive. Recent revivals have shown that you can put Freud into Shakespeare's *Hamlet* without destroying the dramatic experience, but *Cue for Passion* demonstrates that you cannot take Shakespeare out and leave only Freud. In discussing Shakespeare and Racine, Coleridge once pointed out that "the soul is not stupefied into mere sensations by a worthless sympathy with our own ordinary suffering, or an empty curiosity for the surprising, undignified by the language or situations which awe and delight the imagination." *Soul* and *imagination* may be terms which the scientific observer boggles at, but the dramatist neglects them at his peril.

If one tends to become a little weary of disputes about the proper method of reviving Shakespeare, two travelling French companies provided a fresh demonstration of what might be called the rules of handling theatrical classics. The French are, in one way, fortunate in having an unbroken tradition from the seventeenth century for the performance of Corneille and Racine. On the other hand, the very fixedness of the tradition is a challenge to the more ambitious in an age of directors.

The Théâtre National Populaire, under the direction of Jean Vilar, chose to present Corneille's *le Cid* on a stage bare of scenery and sparsely propertied. For most of the performers this was the cue for their actions. The actors were animated statuettes, most memorably Monique Chaumette as the Infanta, who stood firmly beside her chair and with a glazed, expressionless face moved her arms as if pushing aside heavy draperies. This style, so unfamiliar in our theatre, created a sense of inner fire and tension that held the spectator and kept him from realizing the essentially farcical nature of the plot. It was an apt illustration of what has recently been called "the self-conscious stage."

Observe, for example, the business before Roderigue embarks upon his

long narrative of his victory over the enemy. How really alien this kind of dramatic effect is to the tolerance of English-speaking audiences may be realized by comparing it with the Shakespearean treatment of a similar situation: the Bleeding Sergeant groaning out his report of the victory of Macbeth and Banquo. There are no groans in Corneille's communiqué; Roderigue does it himself, every hair in place, and every word chosen with proper regard for unity, coherence, and emphasis. In calling for the report, the King permits himself a grimace of joyous anticipation, solemnly seats himself and three nobles of his court at the four corners of the stage, and gives the starting signal. Roderigue (Gérard Philipe) advances to the center, bows to the auditorium, and renders his solo, while the audience attend with delight the well-wrought artifice. One touch of realism and all collapses; and unfortunately the touch of realism intruded in the interpretation of Chimène by Maria Casares. She pounced upon her character like an operatic soprano attacking Marguerite Gautier. Her palsied hands fluttered over her face, her long handkerchief swirled passionately about her and on occasion relieved her nose, and streams of tears—real tears—flowed down her cheeks, dripped from her chin, and soaked her embonpoint. The result, of course, was to set the audience thinking about the causes of her passion, a fatal thing in the heroic play. But the total effect of the revival was to prove once again that a play lives not only in the words of its author but in the style of the theatre in which he was working.

The point was reinforced by a *Britannicus* in the modernizing hands of a company from the Vieux Colombier. This was a deliberately unconventional production, ignoring most of the techniques of the seventeenth century stage, and investing the play with a kind of power which it never intended to seek out. Solemnity is of course unavoidable in Racine, and the actors relied on expressionless faces and stiffly brocaded costumes as their union label. But if they began by suggesting that they were troubled with problem stomachs, they soon developed the spastic colons which are the hall-mark of a school of modern tragic acting. The director and villain, Raymond Gerome, is a master of the significant look, gliding silently into the scene, menacing up-stage and smiling down-stage, more Sidney Greenstreet than Narcissus. Marguerite Jamois, long-faced and heavy-voiced, looking like the mask of Electra reproduced by Miss Bieber, continually spoiled her effects by thinking about them; the modern thespian heresy that one must feel before one reacts replaced the stylization demanded by the play. Consequently her gestures were awkwardly timed, and one had the impression that one was watching a talkie whose sound track was badly synchronized. Yet one must grant the effectiveness of the scene in Act IV in which she reproaches Nero for his crimes. Rising from the throne at his entrance, she wraps her heavy robe about her and, the loving mother, invites him to sit. As he does so, she launches, full-voiced, into her tirade, then slowly lowers her voice as she leans over him, never losing her firmness until she ends almost sotto voce. If this is one of the "modern touches," with which certain French critics were so pleased, it was completely gripping: the mother hypnotically in control of her son. It was made somewhat easier for her to achieve by the Nero of Jacques François who was more the petulant Fauntleroy than the "monster" referred to by Racine. The effeminacy of the

men in the cast, an effect created partly by the short tunics and long beaded stoles of their costumes, contributed to an unhealthy atmosphere quite different from the psychomachia of the original. And certainly to give full physical expression to the implicit passions of these plays is to destroy them.

3.

Performances of Corneille and Racine will always seem as exotic in the English-speaking theatre as Nōh or Nataka, yet their very exoticness serves to emphasize the principle they demonstrate: stylization is no half-way matter and the actor, as well as the scenery and costumes, must submit to the general plan. It is a principle that American actors, talented as they are, have yet to learn.

Reticence, of course, is rarely demanded of them. Since the second World War our playwrights have been providing them with scripts that are as explicit in words and action as the capacity of audiences will tolerate. One arrogant critic (a novelist) has described these plays as Victorian melodramas, on the ignorant assumption that melodrama was a creation of the nineteenth century. More sympathetic critics complain that our drama is without intellectual content, and that audiences are not made to think but to be "terribly moved." Comparisons are apt to start false arguments about what is good-better-best, but it is perhaps safe to suggest that any intellectual experience of *Oedipus* came after the emotional experience in the Theatre of Dionysos, and that the few records we have of playgoers' memories of the Globe deal with such things as Macbeth's melodramatic discovery of the ghost of Banquo sitting on his newly-acquired throne and Hamlet's leaping into the grave of Ophelia to wrestle with Laertes. Indeed, set beside the explicit blinding of Gloucester, or the dilemma of Mrs. Alving, the impending castration of the hero in *Sweet Bird of Youth* is modest indeed. On the other hand, one would not wish to argue for long that Tennessee Williams, in his later plays, has anything to offer beyond immediate experience, to which his actors and directors have made measurable and equally explicit contributions.

Mr. Williams, however, has of late been turning over rocks in swampy ground in search of subject matter. The American dramatist has traditionally found his most substantial material in more familiar and open places, for example, middle class, urban, business society. And here the open style of acting and directing has served him well.

Three plays of the 1958-1959 season continued to illustrate this traditionally American aspect of dramatic art, though in a somewhat unconventional way. Ranging from hit to flop, each is important, each a provocative and revivable play: *A Raisin in the Sun*, *A Touch of the Poet*, and *Kataki*.

There are too many adventitious circumstances connected with *A Raisin in the Sun* for considered judgment. A Negro author, a Negro cast, a Negro director for the first time joined in a professional Broadway production—it would take Samuel Johnson himself to see beyond the event to the principles of criticism. Yet the continuing success of the play is not that of a stunt; only one secondary aspect of the plot is concerned with what might be called a "Negro problem" as a widow uses her husband's insurance money to buy a house in a segregated district. The real drama is universal, the revolt of the second generation in any social enclave.

The widow's son does not seek freedom but success in terms of the larger society of which he feels himself a part. The theme is very explicitly conveyed in the play's title, taken from a poem by Langston Hughes: "What happens to a dream deferred / Does it dry up / Like a raisin in the sun . . . / Or does it explode?" Walter Lee Younger, the son, is as much a General American type as was Brutus Jones, or Willy Loman, or Aubrey Piper.

To be sure, much of the symbolism points in a rather special direction: Walter's sister, otherwise a typical teen-ager, wraps a native African skirt over her blue jeans, and the skyscrapers projected on the back-drop melt into suggestions of a jungle. But essentially the play deals, as the hero complains, with a group of men tied to a race of women with small minds, ambition versus security, the horizon versus the home, maleness versus femaleness. So commonplace and universal a theme could only achieve theatrical vitality through explicit and vigorous writing, acting, and direction, and this, the production revealed, the Negro members of the profession were thoroughly equipped to provide. The remorseful son, cringing at his mother's knees as she asserts the full power of matriarchal dominion, is an image that will live long in the memory.

A Touch of the Poet is a bad play, but not a poor one. No work of Eugene O'Neill's can ever be considered negligible, and this, the only play of his projected cycle to survive in something approaching finished form, contains moments of rich dramatic experience. It is bad, one suspects, because the author was tired and ill; there is scene after scene of exposition so crude that one desperately wishes for a butler and a maid to come on stage and get it over with. There is repetition which loads the action with bulk rather than significance as in *Long Day's Journey*. There is an interesting character vital to the action who never appears, while some of the minor characters who do appear contribute little but tedium. In extenuation, it must be remembered that this is only part of a larger action, and that O'Neill himself would never have permitted so obviously unfinished a work to appear before the public.

Still one would not have been spared the experience of the play. Con Melody sums up all that O'Neill had been trying to say about the conditions under which life is tolerable. Unlike the futile alcoholics of *The Iceman Cometh*, he takes arms against the sea of illusions in which his life is drowning and becomes a lesser man, but a man, not a ghost. His daughter who has bitterly resented his life of pretence weeps at his descent to reality; this paradoxical action is a truer representation of life as we know it than tragedy can be.

Unfortunately the New York audience saw only a distant approximation of O'Neill's intentions. Helen Hayes, whose long career of tricksiness has generally unsuited her to serious roles, brought a genuine nobility to the tawdry part of Melody's wife, and Kim Stanley, who no longer looks the innocent ingenue, completely justified the excesses of Method acting in her controlled creation of the daughter. But Eric Portman as Melody was not only unintelligible but unintelligent. There was no flair, not even the appropriately false flair, in his performance; he spoke with mashed potatoes in his mouth and ice-water in his veins. A performance like that at the Vienna Burgtheater, with a latter-day James O'Neill in the leading role, realized the full tragicomic pathos of the play, and revealed how, like all of

O'Neill's last works, it is torn out of his own personal agony. *A Touch of the Poet* is the second draft of a masterpiece.

In many ways, the third play of the trio is the most interesting, although it had the shortest stage life. *Kataki* by Shimon Wincelberg calls attention to that underrated aspect of the American commercial theatre, that it has the courage to experiment. There have been two-character plays before this, to be sure, but they have generally concerned a love affair conducted by Van Druten charmers and have relied heavily on Alexander Graham Bell to help the author out of difficulties (what with taxes and increased rates, the nightly telephone bill of *Two for the Seesaw* must nearly equal the salary of half the cast). *Kataki's* two characters are an American and a Japanese, both males, neither of whom can speak the other's language. They are thrown together on a Pacific island unblessed by International Tel and Tel. As a further complication they are soldiers, and enemies.

In spite of what seems an impossible dramatic situation, *Kataki* is no more a stunt than *A Raisin in the Sun*. Its theme is the brotherhood of man, but its conclusions are neither easy nor optimistic. There are the expected attempts at communication, there is the sentimental exchange of family photographs. There are moments of action both exciting and allegorical; a long pursuit through the jungle—skilfully managed by lowering a lightly dappled scrim in front of the single setting, which is then partially revolved to alter perspective—ends as the American boy is trapped in quicksand and the Japanese drives his machete into a tree trunk before rescuing him, professional enmity giving way to the impulses of common humanity. But each entente is precariously based on conflicting hereditary or cultural codes and the final curtain is an end and not a beginning.

Perhaps two other characters might have found a happier way out: doctors, philosophers, priests. But Wincelberg has chosen to write of the mass-man, deliberately selecting from the most commonplace of the two races. If the Japanese, speaking no English, must remain almost as much a mystery to the audience as to his fellow-actor, the young American is fully revealed. He talks endlessly, without observable shape or purpose, about his mid-western boyhood, his teachers, his girls, his mother's cooking, his indoctrination, his unambitious visions of the future. He is the commonest of common young men and he would be intolerably dull if it were not for his situation. When he fails in his attempt to cope with a situation to which he brings no equipment save good will, he fails for us all.

Kataki, then, achieves what Mr. Kazan wanted of *J.B.* In the simplest possible way of the drama it becomes a mirror in which its audience can see itself and be forced to ask The Question. Its failure as a commercial venture may have been due to improper exploitation, to supercilious criticism by a tired reviewer, or, more probably, to the Broadway audience which has learned to substitute petrification by the wiles of Medusa for the fuller dramatic experience of the associated Muses.

The hero of Howard Teichman's *The Girls in 509* is a professor of journalism from a college in the Ozarks. He will not be long remembered, nor will his play, though it contained moments of wise-cracking reminiscent of George Kaufman in highest dudgeon. But playgoers are apt to remember the colleague he told them about, the professor of dramatic criticism. Of course, he explained, nothing much happened in his

course: he just taught his students to hate.

To those Broadway playwrights who are running scared, there must have been something of the shock of recognition in the remark. And to the constant reader of reviews—of Brooks Atkinson dismissing *Kataki* with a grand jest, the "Bright Young Englishman" of *The New Yorker* gleefully comparing *J.B.* with the works of Ogden Nash—it must often appear that the journalist critic dispenses venom with careless boredom. But it is a fact of the general human condition that the dram of e'il outlasts the magnum of praise, and the theatre must bear with it. Further, no true lover would wish his drama to be judged by other than the highest standards, including his own. The question is where these standards, including his own, are to come from.

Until a poetics for the American theatre has been published, an event which can come only after a dramatic mode has lost its creative vitality, standards will usually be contained in manifestoes or essays in comparison. Of the two, comparisons are more instructive for both the critic and the artist he is obliquely addressing. Yet comparisons can be as limited in practice as manifestoes are by definition—a two-week tour of Shaftesbury Avenue or a month's circuit of the European festivals can increase experience without altering the assumptions from which the critic operates.

Let the critic, however, be confronted with a dozen or so deeply involved theatre people from as many European countries. Let him listen for a month to their questions, their enthusiasms, their bewilderments about the American drama. As he searches his memory for facts and experience, as he looks upon this picture of Broadway and that of the Place de l'Opera or Kongens Nytorv, he may be surprised to discover that the theatre which seemed from the drama desk at midnight in New York to be conventional, fad-ridden, conscienceless, emerges as quite another kind of thing.

Such experience awaits the theatre specialist who undertakes to conduct a series of lectures and discussions for the fellows of the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies. The Seminar, founded after the last war as a kind of academic rest-home for European scholars intellectually isolated and economically impoverished by the war, has become with the passing of time perhaps the most fruitful of the non-institutional, privately-sponsored efforts to establish a sympathetic interchange between the old world and the new. A half-dozen seminars are held annually, and every once in a while one is devoted to drama.

Appropriately enough for the subject, the Seminar is housed in an eighteenth-century castle once the property of Max Reinhardt. There is a certain incongruity in sitting before an enormous coal fire in a candelabraed banquet-room beneath an oil painting of the Archbishop of Salzburg *in flagrante allegoria* and discussing William Inge or Thornton Wilder. But the situation is not without its emblematic value. The American drama represents a different world, a world that is not content to be represented in still life, however provocative the layers of symbolism. And if the Europeans sent the first pioneers to make a home in the American wilderness, Broadway has sent back new pioneers to the theatrical deserts of Europe.

We have not been encouraged to think of the European theatre as a desert. We have been instructed in Brecht and Sartre, we have admired the success of

the Théâtre National Populaire, we have been required to be humble before the statistical superiority of British Shakespeare. We ignore our classics, our playwrights are expendable, our theatres are the slaves of the box-office. There is just enough truth in these propositions to make them difficult to argue against whether they are advanced by our own higher critics or by the intellectuals at a Salzburg Seminar. Intellectual, it might be noted, is a designation used more freely on the continent than in the States, but with the same meaning: it describes the mind that is eternally questioning (though more often than not from the unshakable convictions of its own prejudices).

One argument, the least satisfactory, is from statistics. If it is true that an American classic seldom reappears on Broadway, not all of the hundreds and hundreds of plays produced off-Broadway in colleges and communities are *Aaron Slick from Punkin Creek*. And if Philip Barry and Robert E. Sherwood and Sidney Howard are gone from Shubert Alley they are not forgotten on Main Street or in Old Main Auditorium. And a well-fed box-office is at least a sign that the natural processes of artistic life are operating satisfactorily, that transfusions or intravenous feeding from the public treasury will not be necessary for mere survival.

There is another argument, more satisfactory, because *ad hominem*. It is a simple fact that very little is produced in the American theatre that is not known to European audiences through their own experience. Not just O'Neill, whose internationalism has been established for three decades. *Our Town*, that crystallization of the American myth, has probably played more widely on European stages than any other modern drama, in commercial houses, state-supported repertoires, schools, colleges, wherenot. Leafing through the annuals one encounters a play variously known as *Endstation Desire, Omstigning til Paradis, le Tramway nommé desire*; or another called *les Sorcières de Salem, Hexajagt*, or *The Crucible*. And in a random journey of a week or two last winter one might have encountered *My Fair Lady* (of course!), *West Side Story, Fast ein Poet, Two for the Seesaw* (in several mutations), *Orpheus Descending, Engel paa Torvet* (*Look Homeward, Angel*), and a prosperous handful of other recent American plays.

But there is a third argument, more difficult because requiring more patience. For this one must turn to the new plays being produced by the European theatres, and this can be a dispiriting experience: whatever is done will be meticulously acted (perhaps a bit broadly to our taste), and imaginatively produced, for the European theatre has belonged to the director and actor almost since the end of World War I. But unless the play is a classic from the days of the playwrights' theatre, whatever is done is likely to be bloodless and conventional, or some kind of whimsical toy, sniggering despair.

The very eagerness with which British playgoers seize upon anything foreign, whether it be an avant-garde extrapolation of *nihil* from Paris, an exercise in disengagement from East Berlin, or a Greek tragedy with the masks and accents of Brooklyn USA, is a sign of their (seldom stated) discontent with the traditional British well-made play. Not that well-made plays go unattended. As the British traveller returns from his gourmet tour of France and sighs contentedly as he smears mustard on his cold steak and kidney pie, so the British playgoer relaxes with the shabby but tidy domestic dramas whose situa-

tions cuddle his emotions like an old pair of slippers.

Still the British are blessed with a theatre more active than ours and with an astonishingly large group of young playwrights who are dissatisfied with the old patterns. The combination may very well lead to a renaissance of the drama in England if the stranglehold of a producers' monopoly can be broken. The dissatisfied young playwrights, having rejected the old patterns, are seeking to create patterns of their own, and their mentors are Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams. Peter Shaffer's very successful *Five Finger Exercise,* for example, combines the many-roomed set which *Desire under the Elms* and (in another way) *Death of a Salesman* have made a symbolic envelope for domestic tragedy, with the self-pitying young man in quest of love who has become the latter-day hero of Mr. Williams. *The Long and the Short and the Tall* dares to present human beings in conflict, yet with hardly a discernible plot. This is drama of direct experience, and of this American playwrights are at the moment the best teachers.

The freshness of American musical comedy has been long recognized by even the most condescending of our critics and it has been almost as welcome in Europe as travelers' checks. Yet for many years it seems to have affected the box-office without touching the creative forces of the theatre. However, the current season saw the birth of a European musical at once wittier, gayer, and more sardonic than anything Broadway has produced since Mr. Rodgers fell into the gooey embrace of Mr. Hammerstein. *Irma la douce* began in Paris, but it has been completely naturalized in London, and it should find a welcome from any audience sufficiently moral to appreciate amorality. There is a taste of *The Beggar's Opera* in it, and more of *Guys and Dolls,* but it is Runyon with the sentimentality peeled away. It is an instance of the European theatre giving back to us something we seem to have forgotten.

This search for techniques that will lead to a new unity, reflecting the attitudes and problems of the present rather than the past, is just beginning to make some progress in the European theatre. The Archbishop of Salzburg is too concerned with maintaining his status as emblem to notice such things, or doubtless he would disapprove. Not because the theatre is gaudy, or sordid, or worldly, for the Archbishop was a man of the world. But he was a man of *his* world, of a theatre that trusted in convention and stereotype. The American playwrights have brought back to European audiences something of the quality of drama as direct experience, a primitive quality perhaps, but a necessary one if a more sophisticated art is to remain *sub specie humanitatis.*

* * *

ELECTRONIC MEDIA IN THE SOVIET UNION

E. W. Ziebarth

THE contemporary revolution in electronic communications may be as critical for an authoritarian state as is the broader and more dramatic revolution in general technology and applied science. Each of these revolutions, essentially a part of the same wave but rippling out in different directions, is being utilized by the Soviet Union. How effectively they are utilized we do not know with any real degree of precision, but on the basis of presently available data, however limited, we may be able to draw inferences which have some validity. Using radio as one illustration, we need not go beyond the speeches of Comrade Tamarkin, an early director of the Sector of Political Broadcasting, to find evidence of Soviet recognition that radio is "a powerful weapon in the hands of the Party."[1] But to make the weapon effective, not only internationally but within the boundaries of the Soviet Union itself, almost insuperable barriers existed, and in some cases continue to exist.

It is often said that the education which a nation provides for its young people is the best reflection of what the culture of that nation considers important. If this is true of education, it is only slightly less true of the mass media, and particularly of radio and television. In a nation in which these media are tightly controlled and are considered instruments of the state, this generalization may apply with singular force. But problems of coverage of the enormous "service area" of the Soviet Union provide special difficulties found in similar measure almost nowhere else in the world. Even with a single language and similar cultural backgrounds, a land mass of more than eight and a half million square miles and a population of more than two hundred million scattered widely throughout so vast a territory would create communication barriers not easily overcome. When to this we add sharp differences in cultural background, more than eighty languages and a multiplicity of additional language variants, even the most ordinary "domestic" service becomes a problem in what amounts to international communications.

The objectives of the Soviet system are, of course, quite different from those to which Americans are accustomed. What seem to us to be the normal functions of providing information, news, and especially entertainment are secondary in the Soviet Union. As is to be expected, political indoctrination is fundamental, and the extent to which it becomes an obtrusive part of virtually every segment of the broadcast day is startling to some American viewers and listeners. It has been suggested that this indoctrination is a kind of "national institutional commercial" substituted for the goods and services advertising which dominates so great a portion of our own programming.

To serve the Soviet objective effi-

Mr. Ziebarth, (Ph.D., Minnesota, 1948) is Dean of Summer Sessions and Professor of Speech at the University of Minnesota and News Analyst and Consultant, Mid-West Radio and Television Corporation. Late in 1958 he travelled ten thousand miles throughout the Soviet Union making a study of the mass media.

[1] Alex Inkeles, *Public Opinion in Soviet Russia* (Cambridge, Mass., 1951), p. 265.

ciently, a broadcasting system must have an essentially exclusive license to practice, and this the system still provides, although less dramatically than was the case a few years ago. In radio broadcasting, this control, through local rediffusion exchanges, is still substantial.

The All-Union Radio Committee (now the State Committee of Radio and Television Broadcasting), working under the Council of Ministers, was responsible for the organization and development of the Soviet broadcasting system. Until 1939 the radio committee was a part of the Ministry of Posts and Telegraph, but when the All-Union Radio Committee was formed, it became a body somewhat similar to a ministry, with its chairman attending all meetings of the Council of Ministers. The All-Union Radio Committee itself was a body of substantial size including in its membership representatives of a number of organizations such as trade unions, writers and musicians groups, and a variety of others.[2] Under the direction of that committee were developed the three traditional grades of programs, Central, Local, and Lower. The latter in the strictest sense should not be included as a broadcasting level since it does not reach the airwaves, but is circulated through the rediffusion, or radio-diffusion exchanges. It is, however, a most important aspect of Soviet broadcasting, since it is completely controlled, with no possibiiity of jamming, interference, or "free" listening, simply involving a relay facility which picks up appropriate material from the Central Moscow-dominated system, and then by wire circulates that material to apartments, homes, and public squares in the communities which it serves. To the output of the Central broadcasting system, these exchanges add their own appropriate local or regional materials, thus giving to the listener the choice between, let us say, Radio-Moscow and radio off; not a wide or substantial range of choices!

In addition to the Central broadcasting system and the Lower grade programs which have traditionally originated through the radio-diffusion exchange, there is the Local system. In this system, the station operates essentially as a relay unit from the Central program, then broadcasts to its own region, frequently in the language of the area, materials of regional importance or interest. Estimates of the numbers of such stations vary and statistics are notably difficult to check, but we may suppose that there are about one hundred fifty local stations, and between two and three thousand radio-diffusion exchanges.

The development of group listening in the Soviet Union has also been a significant aspect of the communications system. When sets were not generally available, it was in many cases necessary to listen in the factory, on the collective farm, or in one of the many listening auditoriums maintained by the diffusion exchanges. The writer found that hotel rooms in most parts of the Soviet Union were equipped with loud-speakers fed by a local radio station which depended primarily on Radio-Moscow for its materials. In several instances, as he returned to his room at odd hours during the day, he would find a maid or maintenance worker seated comfortably before his speaker listening to programs with evident relish, and not at all embarrassed by his unexpected return. It may be of some interest to point out that neither were these listeners at all

[2] Waclaw Solski, *Soviet Propaganda in Action* (Mid-European Studies Center, Research Documents, no. 33) Washington, D. C., undated, p. 85. Microfilm on file at University of Minnesota.

embarrassed or noticeably affected by the fact that the speakers might be blaring out the most violent denunciation of American policy in the Formosa Straits or Berlin; at any rate the listeners seemed as cordial and friendly as they might have been if the sounds issuing from the speakers were more consonant, originating from the gifted pens of Shostakovich, Prokofiev, or Khatchaturian.

Group listening, however, has another dimension as well, since many programs have been designed for special group consumption: thus collective farmers, for example, are presented with materials designed for their special interests, and the same applies to the military, to industrial workers, and to children's groups.

Agitprop—the Department of Propaganda and Agitation of the Communist Party Central Committee—is responsible for Soviet propaganda activities, and has handled them since 1939. The All-Union Committee on Radio Information worked closely with Agitprop in developing effective methods of carrying out the policy line established by the Presidium.[3] Programs beamed abroad are planned under the direction of G. U. R. V., the Administrative Board of Radio Broadcasting, which in turn reports to the State Committee for Cultural Relations with foreign countries. International radio propaganda materials are actually prepared through the Department of Psychological Warfare of the Foreign Office, known as the Foreign Broadcasting Sector. Control of program content and structure is considerably more rigid than the complicated structure of the administrative system may seem to imply, and constant checks on program content as well as levels of performance are being carried out.

At the end of World War II complaints were heard about the slowness with which new sets were being manufactured, but with the importance of the medium clearly recognized in high places, production schedules were improved, and by 1956 the UNESCO publication of International Statistics Relating to Education, Culture, and Communications reported that in the U.S.S.R. there were an estimated 25 million receivers, or about 129 per thousand inhabitants. Added to these were an estimated 820,000 television receivers,[4] a figure which has since been revised upward, with the Ministry of Communication reporting two million in use in July 1957. A report to the author from the embassy of the U.S.S.R. indicated that early in 1959 there were nearly three million sets in use, and independent estimates tend to confirm that figure. In interpreting the 25 million figure for radio sets in 1956, it is important to recognize that as many as twenty million were of the wired variety.

The writer, in raising questions about available receivers with radio and television executives in the Soviet Union, was given answers ranging from modest to obviously inflated. A conservative but probably valid estimate based upon both Soviet and Western sources is that there are in 1959 over two and one-half million television receivers. We may also assume that there are about thirty-five million radio receivers, of which more than twenty million are in fact wired speakers.

Soviet sources, presumed to be reasonably accurate in this instance, provide comparative data on Soviet and

[3] John L. Martin, *International Propaganda* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958), p. 46.

[4] *Basic Facts and Figures*, UNESCO, 1956, Addendum page not numbered.

North American receiving sets for several sample periods. In interpreting these data, however, three factors should be kept in mind: these are Soviet surveys, the data do include wired speakers as well as regular sets, and the comparison is with North America, not with the United States. (If the comparison were with the U. S. alone, the differences would, of course, be substantially increased.)

A *U.S.S.R. Speaking* report[5] points out that as of January 1935 the U.S.S.R. had 2.3 million sets while there were 25.5 million in North America and 23.5 million in Western Europe. Perhaps these figures are more meaningful when related to population: 13 to 14 receivers for 1,000 or about 1 for every 75 persons in the U.S.S.R., compared with 160 per 1,000 or 1 for 6 persons in North America. By 1940 the Soviet figure had risen to only 24 to 27 per 1,000, whereas some Western nations reported up to 200.

If we keep in mind the fact that up to 1947 even many of the collective farms were without receiving apparatus of any kind, and that individual farmers rarely had an opportunity to listen except at a central location,[6] we will have a somewhat more accurate picture of the receiving situation during the postwar period. Rural areas, and even some of the more remote republics as a whole, were very seriously under-equipped.

During the war receivers as well as transmitters were systematically destroyed by the Germans, especially as they began to retreat, and it was not until the beginning of 1946 that the number of speakers was reported to exceed the prewar level.[7] Perhaps the most dramatic illustration of the postwar level of available receivers is to be found in an appeal written for *Pravda* on Radio Day 1947, in which the President of the Radio Committee speaks of the need to revive the crystal set, long forgotten by most listeners in the Western world:

> The crystal set has undeservedly been completely forgotten. It is a seriously mistaken point of view to regard the crystal set, as many do, as outmoded, having significance only for the early development of radio technique. To meet the needs of the rural population, 20 to 25 million radio receivers are needed. To provide this number by means of radio-diffusion exchanges or to build tube radio sets would not be a mere matter of a decade. It is clear that the village cannot wait upon such a tempo. Organizing the output of crystal receivers will enable us to reduce by several times the period required for the mass radiofication of the village.[8]

The following table based upon the sources cited and adapted through the year 1951 from Inkeles with author's estimates for the following years, will provide at a glance a picture of the development of the diffusion network. It should be noted that these data are estimates, and that in most cases they depend directly or indirectly upon Soviet sources.[9]

THE SOVIET RADIO-DIFFUSION NETWORK

Year[1]	Number of speakers in the radio-diffusion exchanges
1929	22,000 [2]
1933	1,360,000 [2]
1937	2,946,000 [3]
1940	1,934,000 [3]
1941	5,500,000 [4]
1945	5,000,000 [5]
1946	5,700,000 [6]
1947	6,500,000 [6]
1948	7,300,000 [7]
1951	10,000,000 [8]
1956	20,000,000 [9]
1959	24,000,000 [10]

1. All data are for January 1 except the 1941 figure, which is for June.
2. Adapted from data in *Socialist Construction in the U.S.S.R.*, 1936.

5 *U.S.S.R. Speaking*, no. 2, (1936), p. 46.
6 *Pravda*, May 8, 1947.
7 *Ibid.*, May 7, 1947.
8 *Ibid.*, May 8, 1947.
9 Inkeles, p. 248.

3. Goron, *Radiobroadcasting*, p. 14 does not specify the month, but other evidence indicates reference was to the first of the year.
4. *Izvestiya*, December 16, 1944, stated the number to be in excess of 5.5 million.
5. Fortushenko, *Fifty Years of Radio*, p. 77.
6. An estimate based on statements in *Izvestiya*, May 7, 1946, and May 7, 1947, and in *Pravda*, May 7 and 8, 1947.
7. An estimate based on data given in *Radio*, 1948: no. 1, pp. 1-2; no. 3, p. 2; no. 6, pp. 1-4.
8. An estimate based on the plan to increase the net of wired speakers by 75 percent during the Fourth Plan.
9. Author's estimate, based upon Soviet interviews.
10. Author's estimate, based upon Soviet interviews.

In a personal report to the writer from the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics dated November 28, 1958, it was stated that as of that date there were more than 60 television "centers" in the Soviet Union with the number increasing "every month." The report reflects characteristic optimism regarding the possibility of reaching the quota of 75 stations by 1960 and predicts that that quota will not only be met but will be "over-fulfilled." In regard to the relay system which has been under construction, however, only three stations were connected to Moscow by mid-1959, with four more scheduled to be linked later in the year or early in 1960.

The Soviet television system involves a picture made up of 625 lines, and the majority of the sets now in use, based upon the observation of the writer, appear to have 12-inch screens, with some larger ones coming into use. Among the new designs are the Rubin-101 and the Temp 32m with screen diagonals of 21 inches, and a new Almax-101 with a screen diagonal of 24 inches.

The exchange of musical tape recordings and of a wide variety of other program materials with other nations is mentioned often by Soviet communications officials, but interviews with Soviet listeners have failed to indicate (to the writer) that these are often heard or that they make much impact if they are. Exchanges, as is to be expected, are largely between the U.S.S.R. and satellite or uncommitted countries, although an occasional program from one of the Western nations may be presented.

A quick look at some of the 1700 literary and dramatic broadcasts presented during 1955 reflects the pattern: among the new works introduced were those of Dacroub (Lebanon), Mohammed Diba (Algeria), and Boren Bochu (India).

Children's broadcasts are of special importance in the Soviet system, and average at least four hours a day. In 1955, according to data quoted by Viatcheslav Tchernychev, Deputy Director-General of Radio-Moscow, about two thousand broadcasts for children were presented. These were devoted largely to music and to what are called "educational" materials.

Lectures and talks are, of course, a basic part of the fare provided for the Soviet listener. Soviet sources list up to 430 talks a year dealing with scientific and economic matters. Medicine, agriculture, and the biological sciences are also included in the schedule of "talks," and in the case of medicine there is an effort to cover practical public health instruction under the title "Advice from the Doctor." Talks dealing with "economic matters" are often party-line indoctrination, as are some of those which deal with the biological sciences, although most observers appear to accept talks on medicine and the physical sciences as informative and objective if not sparkling.

Radio transmissions are available during most of the 24 hours in the Moscow area, and during daytime as well as evening hours in many other parts

of the Soviet Union. Programs devoted to relatively serious music take the greatest single blocks of time, although up to 23 per cent of the broadcast material is said to be made up of talks. Such programming includes a variety of materials, such as special programs for children, "news," commentary on international and foreign affairs, lectures on quotas and production goals as well as on Marxism and the nature of the Soviet state.

There are many so-called news programs during each broadcast day, but the content of these programs is quite different from that of newscasts in western nations. There is lengthy discussion of production quotas, of the awarding of prizes for the over-fulfilling of quotas, with biting comment about Western imperialism sprinkled generously throughout the programs. Editorials taken from leading Soviet newspapers are read at tedious length, but newscasts almost never include stories of human interest or of personal fortune, good or ill, and robberies, murders, fires, airplane crashes have no place in the program. The crash of the TU 104 A on the Peiping to Moscow run late in 1958 was released largely because foreigners were aboard, and it would have been impossible to keep the story from reaching the world press.

An American television viewer in the Soviet Union is immediately struck by a number of program elements aside from the heavy load of propaganda materials carried by the television system. He reacts first of all, perhaps, to their general quality. He is likely to feel that full-length musical and dramatic programs are relatively good, particularly when telecast from original performances; that much of the material designed especially for television tends to be ponderously and somewhat awkwardly produced, that for the most part picture quality is something less than excellent, and he may find startling the fact that programs, unlike those in the United States, do not run from early morning until late at night, but are broadcast for only four or five hours on weekdays, beginning at six in the evening, and for about ten to possibly as much as twelve hours on Sundays. This is done quite deliberately, since it makes it impossible for housewives (and children during vacation periods) to devote their daytime hours to relatively unproductive viewing. This objective is quite frankly stated by communications executives, and by other Soviet officials as well. It is pointed out that since the majority of Soviet women are working, it would be manifestly foolish to interfere with this enormously important source of productivity by providing a competitive distraction.

Films shown on Russian television are often among the newest and best fare available to Soviet cinema-goers, since there is no agreement that they must be shown in theaters for a prolonged period preceding their release for television. A motion picture may be released on television within two weeks of the time it has had its first showing in a theater. While regular feature films are presented, propaganda footage is also used regularly. For example, a film showing the Soviet version of the revolt in Hungary was televised roughly two months after the tragic events of October 1956, and was designed to give the impression that what occurred was a counter-revolution, reactionary in nature, and master-minded by American and other capitalist terrorists. This film was shown over and over again, presumably on the assumption that repetition is an aid to persuasion.

Among the most popular children's

programs, an important segment of the evening schedule, are cartoons, the telling of fairy-tales, and even the presentation of puppet shows. The Russian puppet theater, from which many of these children's performances are borrowed, is among the most distinguished of its kind in the world, and these puppet performances are often excellent.

There is popular criticism of radio and television programming, and letters to the editors in Soviet newspapers frequently make reference to inferior productions. Occasionally, too, a full-scale documented criticism which has been known to coincide with the dismissal of a director, producer, or even a top executive will appear, presumably written by a disgruntled viewer or listener, but clearly inspired by an official or semi-official source.

Programs devoted to critical comment are produced at irregular but fairly frequent intervals, with an announcer (likely to be a woman) reading letters of criticism. In answering them she will frequently point out that the viewer or the listener is right, that certain things were not well handled, and that an effort to improve is being made and will continue to be made.

Perhaps the most impressive television programming is that which originates directly from the theater or sports stadium. Unlike the American practice of emphasizing studio productions, Soviet television drama is likely to be a straightforward presentation of a play from a Moscow theater, or the televising of a concert or sports event. Many of these programs are superb because the theater presentation or concert itself is superb, and since the Soviet producer does not feel compelled to use startling or unusual camera angles, one is frequently treated to a play or concert of high quality with a minimum of distraction.

The news analyst, or commentator, so familiar to Americans, does not play a similar role in the Soviet Union. Instead, the editor of a publication or a leading writer on political or economic affairs will appear to present an editorial or an interpretation of what is going on in the world. These programs are frequently anti-Western diatribes, and on most occasions are expressions of a semi-official Soviet point of view.

It is difficult to generalize about patterns of exposure to Soviet communications media, and firsthand observation provides a very limited base upon which to draw inferences. Rossi and Bauer, after 2,700 interviews with displaced persons, have concluded that exposure reflects a highly stratified society.[10] Such exposure, they suggest, is strongly related to occupation, education, and residence, but weakly related to age and sex factors. Five occupational groups are identified as constituting the most active segment: the arts, applied sciences, professions, semi-professions, and white-collar workers. Such data, based upon displaced person interviews, are difficult to confirm by direct and essentially uncontrolled observation, but within the limits of such substantial observational variables, appeared to the author to be accurate.

Nowhere in either the Soviet literature or in the listening experiences of the author was there found an equivalent to the inscription which once greeted those who entered the portals of the British Broadcasting Corporation: "Nations Shall Speak Peace Unto Nations!"

[10] Peter H. Rossi and Raymond A. Bauer, "Some Patterns of Soviet Communications Behavior," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XVI (Winter 1952-53), p. 665.

DECISION BY DEBATE: A RE-EXAMINATION

Douglas Ehninger

READERS of this journal, I assume, are familiar with the criticisms commonly leveled against debate as a method for settling differences and arriving at shared beliefs and decisions. Prominent among them are these: (1) Debate, unlike other available modes of deliberation, does not result in a reflective or critical judgment because it does not employ a critical method. (2) Debate, instead of being a technique of investigation—a means for discovering and testing ideas, is a technique of persuasion, suitable only for propagating ideas and impressing them on others. (3) Debate, instead of implementing the desirable attitudes and processes of co-operation, emphasizes the undesirable attitudes and processes of conflict.[1]

Admittedly, these charges strike at the heart of the debate process. Insofar as they are justified debate is not only undesirable but dangerous, and must, therefore, be rejected as a method for making collective choices and formulating collective judgments.

But are these criticisms valid? In my view, each of them arises out of a misconception of the nature and purpose of debate. I believe that if we will examine its rationale afresh, and without predisposition or prejudice, we will see (1) that the end and method of debate are critical, (2) that debate is of the genre of investigation rather than persuasion, and (3) that debate is a co-operative rather than a competitive enterprise.

2.

First, then, on what ground may the method of debate be called critical?

The distinguishing marks of a critical instrument, I take to be these: (1) The end aimed at by that instrument is a reasoned or reflective judgment, rather than a judgment made impulsively through the dictates of desire, prejudice, or authority. (2) The method employed in arriving at judgment is equipped with such internal checks and controls as render it essentially self-regulative.[2] Debate, I submit, meets both these requirements.

In order to insure that judgment will be critical rather than impulsive, in the courtroom and legislative chamber debate is surrounded with an elaborate code of rules. These determine the types of evidence and appeal that are admissible and the points in the argument at which they may be introduced, and sometimes even dictate the inference that is to be drawn from a given set of facts. But in addition to these imposed

Mr. Ehninger (Ph.D., Ohio State, 1949) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Florida. He is associate editor of QJS, *former editor of* Southern Speech Journal, *and editor-elect of* SM.

[1] Much of the philosophical groundwork for these charges was furnished more than three decades ago by John Dewey. See, for example, *The Public and Its Problems* (New York, 1927), especially Chapter VI, "The Problem of Method." Cf. Harrison S. Elliott, *The Process of Group Thinking* (New York, 1928), pp. 1-8; James H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, *Discussion in Human Affairs* (New York, 1950), pp. 3-14.

[2] Morris R. Cohen and Ernest Nagel, *An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method* (New York, 1934), p. 191ff.

regulations, any form of debate worthy of the name—whether it occurs in the smoking car, on the street corner, or at the business conference—has embedded in the essentials of its procedure important controls which help guarantee that judgment will be reflective. (1) Each party has an equal opportunity to develop his view. (2) Each calls upon the other to set forth for public examination the facts and reasoning upon which that view is based. (3) Judgment is suspended until both sides have been fully heard. (4) The decision that finally emerges is made not by the contending parties themselves, but by an impartial individual or body playing the responsible role of arbitrator.[3]

These controls, of course, may deliberately be circumvented, or debate may be so ineptly practiced that much of their effectiveness is lost. This, however, is human failure. As Mortimer Adler reminds us, we must not confuse the self-regulative character of a method with "the disciplinary measures necessary to make human nature capable of the manner of discourse so regulated."[4] The important point is that the process of debate provides the necessary internal checks and balances. These will operate in proportion as we can discipline our appetites and develop our skills so as to give them effective play.

If built-in controls were not so inescapable a part of the structure of debate, debate would not invariably be avoided by those speakers or writers whose purpose is to "short-circuit" the reflective process. Nor, on the other hand, would it be so eagerly sought out and practiced by those who regard the public welfare as paramount. To the earnest debater, the inherent controls of his method are not obstacles, but aids to informed and critical judgment. Unlike the unscrupulous persuader who seeks to evade them, the debater believes that a reflective judgment produced by the aid of these controls is the only sort worth the winning. Valuable in its own right, it will also, he is convinced, prove best for the group or society concerned.

So much, then, for the end or aim of debate. Let us now consider its method.

Whereas the judgment invited by debate is critical because it is reflective, the method employed by debate in pursuing that judgment is critical because it is self-regulative.

In addition to presenting his own view of the matter under discussion, each debater also has the obligation of probing and criticizing the view of his opponent. This is so commonplace a feature of debate that its significance is easily overlooked. Yet it is the most important of all the built-in controls. As a method, debate not only allows but *requires* that an informed partisan systematically probe in public a view of a matter which if adopted will result in the rejection of an alternative view in which he sincerely believes.

William James termed this "the test of enlightened self-interest."[5] In areas where the empirical methods of the laboratory are inapplicable it is, perhaps, the most searching test of an idea that can be devised. If under such probing, false claims are not exposed and debate is not critical, the fault, again, lies exclusively in application. The

[3] This characteristic alone is sufficient to establish the critical nature of the debate process. The debater does not appeal for "acceptance," but for "arbitration." The judging or adjudicating agency is not a passive and inert "sink"; it is a thinking, reflecting, considering force that uses the evidence and arguments presented to *come* in its own mind to the decision they appear to warrant.

[4] Mortimer Adler, *Dialectic* (New York, 1927), p. 185.

[5] William James, "The Will to Believe," *The Will to Believe and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy* (London, 1909), p. 21.

method itself provides each party ample opportunity to police the views of his opponent.

In short, debate, when properly and competently practiced, is a critical instrument not only because it aims at a reflective judgment, but also because it does this by employing a method that is persistently self-regulative.

3.

Why, let us next inquire, should debate be regarded as a mode of investigation rather than of persuasion?[6]

It is a mode of investigation for the very reason that its end and method are critical.

As distinguished from the general run of public persuaders—the propagandist, the ad writer, the pitchman, the "public relations expert," the "psychic huckster" —the debater does not seek conviction regardless of the terms. To him it is more important that his method be sound and that decision be reflective than that any particular result be obtained by his appeals. If this were not the case he could easily find quicker and surer ways to win acceptance for his view—ways that involve far fewer risks to the success of the cause he espouses. These are available in legion. They range downward from the blatant devices of censorship and open threat to the subtlest modes of suggestion and indirect persuasion. Most professional public persuaders resort to such methods daily. Instead of turning to any of these, however, by the very act of selecting debate as his method, the debater openly renounces them. Fully aware of what he is doing, he foregoes the convenience and easy sureness of "short-circuit" persuasives, shouldering the labors and accepting the risks implicit in the critical approach. In the debater's code, investigation not only must precede decision, but is an integral part of the decision-making process. Persuasion must run the gamut of the silent criticism of the judge and the open attack of an opponent. In all phases of the process of debate labors and dangers abound for him who chooses it.

To understand the full significance of the choice the debater makes, one may perform five mental experiments. (1) Inquire, "Do fanatics and rigid sectarians appeal for arbitration or for unqualified belief and unthinking acceptance?" (2) Contrast the patient examination of evidence in a court of law with the impulsive, emotionally charged decision of a mob fired by its leader. (3) Recall how frequently a certain cut of candidate for political office refuses to meet his opponent in public debate. (4) Answer this question: Does the advertiser contract for equal time or space for his closest competitor, and ask that buyers delay their decision until both sides have been fully heard? (5) Most revealing of all, perhaps, listen to an hour of earnest debating in a courtroom or legislative assembly—or, for that matter, even in a school debate tournament. Then compare it with an hour's run of radio or television commercials.

These experiments should help to clarify the difference between the debater and most professional public persuaders, and should help us understand why he, unlike them, is essentially an investigator. They should emphasize the difference between the way of the truth-seeker and the way of the speaker or writer whose concern is conviction, no matter what the price.

[6] In this and the following section I have drawn at several points upon the excellent essay by Professor Wayne N. Thompson, "Discussion and Debate: A Re-Examination," *QJS*, XXX (October, 1944), 288-299.

In deciding whether a man is essentially an investigator or essentially a persuader the crucial test is this: Does he prefer truth at the expense of victory, or does he prefer victory at the expense of truth? When faced with this alternative, the man who chooses "truth" has by that very choice rightfully earned the name of investigator. The man who chooses victory can only be regarded as a persuader.

By drawing this dichotomy, I do not mean to imply that truth and victory are incompatible. Not only may they coincide; it may even be, as Aristotle argued, that they have a natural affinity for each other.[7] Such speculation is, however, irrelevant to our present purpose. For this it is enough to know whether a man prefers truth to victory or victory to truth. And it is inconceivable that anyone who makes victory paramount would grant an opponent the opportunities and advantages he enjoys in free debate between equals.

Because debate is a critical instrument, it is, then, by virtue of this fact, also an instrument of investigation rather than of persuasion.

4.

What, now, of the third and last of the propositions advanced at the outset? On what ground may we argue that debate is fundamentally a co-operative enterprise?

It is, of course, altogether understandable why debate should so frequently be regarded as a species of conflict—as a pitched battle in which two fixed and unalterable judgments engage in a life-and-death struggle for supremacy. The debater attacks an opponent's view for the purpose of defeating it and thus making his own prevail. Moreover, by the logic of debate method, these competing views are mutually exclusive. When one is accepted the other is automatically rejected and cast aside.

At the same time, however, we must not lose sight of two important facts. The first is this: In debate ideas come into conflict within the broader framework of a distinctly co-operative endeavor—one that is co-operative because it is governed by the four basic terms and agreements outlined above. Each party has an equal opportunity to be heard; each grants the other the right of examining and criticizing his arguments; each is willing that judgment be suspended until the facts are in; and each agrees to abide by the decision of a neutral arbitrating agency.

Let us contrast these stipulations and agreements with the characteristic attitudes and procedures of conflict. Here, whether the conflict occurs in the realm of words and persuasion or in the realm of physical combat and war, the picture is markedly different. In conflict, instead of freely granting an opponent an equal opportunity, every effort is made to curb his freedom of statement and action; instead of willingly opening one's resources to his inspection, every effort is made to conceal or disguise them; instead of asking that a decision be suspended, all efforts are directed toward curtailing or terminating the contest; and instead of openly seeking an awarded or arbitrated decision, this sort of resolution is accepted reluctantly, and only when all hope for victory through force has been lost. These, I suggest, are the characteristic attitudes and procedures of conflict, and they are a far cry from the attitudes and procedures that characterize the debate process.

The second, and equally important, fact to keep in mind in this connection is that in debate the elements of conflict which are present operate on the

[7] *Rhetoric*, 1355a.

level of "means," and not of "ends." Ideas are put into competition not for their own sake, but in order to determine which of two formulations will better implement a common value or which of two paths will more surely lead to a common goal.

It is as if a party of mountain climbers, concerned for their mutual safety, were to test two ropes in every conceivable way, and then to select for their common use the one that proved stronger. In debate, two parties, concerned for their mutual well-being and the well-being of society as a whole, assume that the view which better withstands exhaustive criticism will more often than not prove to be the "truth" or to "work out" in practice. And just as the principal test used on the ropes is to determine how much strain each will bear, so in debate the principal test of an idea is to see how well it will stand up under attack. In order to claim a place among those instruments which seek to formulate social choices and decisions co-operatively, a mode of argumentative deliberation need not exhibit harmony on the level of "means" as well as on that of "ends." The test applicable to means is not to ask whether they implement an atmosphere of deference, but whether they adhere to those basic attitudes of fact-centered objectivity that earn for them the name of critical. In this sense, as even its most enthusiastic devotees admit, the rational conflict of ideas lies at the heart of creative group discussion, just as it lies at the heart of debate.

While the procedure employed in debate is to try the mettle of ideas by entering them into competition, the debate process as a whole is, then, not an intellectual combat, but a co-operative testing device. Men, as Aristotle long ago pointed out, deliberate "not about the ends to be attained, but about the means of attaining them."[8] Every debate that ever has occurred or ever will occur must be dominated by a basic harmony of aim, growing out of a set of values common to both of the contending parties. Unless the opposing debaters have the same end in view—peace, prosperity, social welfare, national security, or whatever it may be—no debate is possible. There is no ground upon which they may come together in argument; no area where the thrusts of proof and the counterthrusts of refutation may meet and interact. The absence of such a ground is what made it impossible for the Democracies to debate with Hitler in 1936 and 1938, and what makes it difficult for us to debate with the representatives of the Soviet Union today. Where values and ends are disparate, ideas don't get across; proofs fail to clash; facts are meaningless.[9]

Because the purpose of debate is to test alternative means of achieving a common end, the proposition advanced in a debate is not, as some suppose, a fixed and unalterable conclusion or "outcome of thought." Instead, it is a close relative of the scientist's "hypothesis." The debate itself is not a process of intentional analysis and reasoning aimed at the confirmation of a prior premise. It is a "rational elaboration" of the hypothesis that is offered—a careful tracing out of its implications as a means of estimating its validity or worth.

Without some conflict of ideas in the sense of examining or testing, no intellectual life would be possible. The very notion of "truth," embodying, as it does, the correlative notion of "false-

[8] *Ibid.*, 1362a.

[9] See A. Craig Baird, "Responsibilities of Free Communication," *Vital Speeches*, September 1, 1952, pp. 699-701.

ness," implies selection and rejection, choice and avoidance, the acceptance of one alternative and the consequent discarding of another. Even the most self-evident of propositions—the wetness of water, the greenness of grass, the inevitability of death and taxes—imply the rejection of their contraries. To this extent at least they are the end products of conflict, with its inevitable elements of victory and defeat.

The important question about conflict in any intellectual process is not its presence or absence. Present it must be if any constructive thought or deliberation is to occur. What we must always ask is this: On what level does the conflict take place? What end does it serve? In what spirit is it conducted?

So far as debate is concerned, our answers are these: Conflict occurs on the level of means, and in the service of ends. It is used for constructive, not destructive purposes. And it is conducted in a critical fashion because it is articulated by a self-regulative method. While conflict is present in debate, as it must be in all intellectual activity, it constitutes only a sub-movement within the broader framework of a co-operative enterprise. As a result of conflict the preferred decision emerges at once chastened and strengthened by the measure of truth that resides in its rejected opposite, for in debate that measure of truth is presented in a way that compels full attention to its claim. "He that wrestles with us," said Edmund Burke, "strengthens our nerves and sharpens our skill. Our antagonist is our helper." To call debate a species of conflict is, in short, to confuse the part with the whole—to mistake the role of the participant for the method itself. Debate, considered as a generic mode of deliberation, is, we must conclude, a co-operative endeavor.

5.

Lest I be misunderstood, by way of conclusion let me emphasize the fact that it has not here been my purpose to undertake to write a clean bill of health for debate as practiced—to argue that as it is carried on in the schoolroom, the courthouse, the legislative assembly, the political campaign, or the business conference debate is uniformly pure and unabused. Aberrations have been, are today, and undoubtedly always will be committed in its name. Nor, for that matter, would I even contend that debate as a method of collective decision-making is without limitations. Applicable only when problem situations have been reduced to alternatives, it tends to disregard the view of the minority, is rigid and formal, and is an extremely difficult form of deliberation for the average person to practice effectively. But no method—even the one we call "scientific"—is as flexible and responsive, or as widely applicable or easily mastered as we might like it to be.

Excesses in practice or limitations in scope do not warrant the making of unjust charges against the process itself. Properly practiced, debate as a method is not uncritical, is not *a priori*, and does not emphasize unduly the attitudes and procedures of conflict. On the contrary, as I have undertaken to demonstrate: (1) because it pursues a reflective end by employing a self-regulative method, debate may legitimately be regarded as a critical instrument; (2) because it is critical, it may further be regarded as investigatory; and (3) because in debate conflict takes place within a framework of commonly accepted terms and stipulations, and on the level of "means" rather than of "ends," it may be called a co-operative rather than a competitive enterprise.

BENJAMIN F. BUTLER, PROSECUTOR

Gordon L. Thomas

The Occasion

THE morning of March 30, 1868, was bright and clear in Washington, with more than a promise of spring in the air. Carriages filled with fashionably dressed women were moving down the rutted dirt thoroughfare of Pennsylvania Avenue toward the Capitol building, passing a steady stream of Washingtonians walking in the same direction. By eleven o'clock the rotunda of the halls of Congress was jammed with a seething crowd of humanity, all attempting to gain admittance to the Senate Chamber. The Messenger of the Senate, Mr. J. I. Christie, tried desperately and with as much patience as he could muster, to cope with the crowd of people who attempted to force their way into the hall, the women alternately coquettish and angry, the men indignant and somewhat self-conscious amid all this feminine finery. But only those who held tickets of admission could be allowed in the Senate gallery. Those who were not so fortunate stood outside in the rotunda muttering threats and complaining that Senators and Representatives had been selling the tickets to the highest bidders; long lines of Negroes, their shabby clothes a sharp contrast to the gay apparel of the "white folks," stood patiently in the vain hope that some of them might be allowed to enter.[1]

Inside the Senate Chamber, the Senators of the 40th Congress were attempting to conduct business as usual under the most trying circumstances. A steady hum arose from the galleries, which even now were almost full; here and there a spectator, having arrived early to secure a choice seat, munched on a thick piece of bread which he had brought with him. Brightly colored dresses of the women interspersed by the somber clothes of the male members of the audience, with the gold, silver, and russet fans of the ladies creating the impression of a "gentle typhoon whistling all the leaves in Vallambrosa,"[2] and with the opera glasses of the hopeful young ladies trained on the eligible bachelors in the reporters' and diplomatic galleries, gave the whole scene somewhat of a carnival air. A correspondent of the New York *Times* noted at one of the sessions:

> While the Senate was out for deliberation yesterday I espied a lady in the gallery *knitting*—crocheting, I suppose she calls it—and I hereby tender her my compliments, and beg to accord her the distinction of being the counterpart of the famous knitters of the French Revolution, who sat on the scaffold and worked their needles, dropping a stitch to mark the fall of the guillotine every time a head dropped into the basket.[3]

Indeed the time of execution had finally arrived; Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, had been impeached for "high crimes and misdemeanors" by the House of Representatives and was to be tried by the United

Mr. Thomas (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1952) is Associate Professor of Speech at Michigan State University. He presented the original of this article as a paper at the SAA Convention in Boston in August 1957.

[1] New York *Times*, March 16, 1868.

[2] *Ibid.*, March 31, 1868.

[3] *Ibid.*, March 16, 1868.

States Senate. This indeed was a momentous event in a period filled with great historical happenings. An ailing Charles Dickens was touring America giving readings to audiences who had less trouble securing tickets for his lecture than did those attending the impeachment; Jefferson Davis was facing trial for treason; the Barnum Museum in New York City had just been destroyed by fire; Benjamin Disraeli had only recently become Prime Minister of England; and a fireman in New Jersey had committed suicide because his horses had balked on the way to a fire, thereby having his engine arrive too late to be of any help.

At 12:30 p. m., the Sergeant-at-Arms, George T. Brown, rose and commanded silence; a hush fell over the audience; Ben Wade, who had been in the Speaker's chair, walked to the one unoccupied Senator's desk; and Salmon P. Chase, Chief Justice of the United States, tall, clean-shaven, clad in black robes, was escorted to the Speaker's chair by Senator Samuel C. Pomeroy of Kansas. The Sergeant-at-Arms called out the familiar "Hear ye! Hear ye!" and the actual impeachment trial commenced. Down the center aisle walked the five members of the President's counsel, including Henry Stanbery, who had resigned as Attorney-General in order to assist in the trial, and Benjamin Curtis, ex-Justice of the Supreme Court. They seated themselves at a large table at the presiding officer's right. Immediately afterwards, Mr. Brown announced the presence of the managers of the impeachment; two by two, arm in arm, they walked slowly to their places at Justice Chase's left.[4] All eyes were centered on two figures. One, already seated, was that of Thaddeus Stevens, bitterest of the Radical Republicans, who at this moment was at Death's door. Just two weeks previously, Representative Julian of Indiana had written in his diary, "I doubt whether he [Stevens] can live another week."[5] Yet a few moments before, he had entered the chamber, leaning on a cane, dragging his club foot along the floor, his death-like pallor and black wig giving him a strange and unearthly appearance. Stevens had clung desperately to life, long enough to see that "wretched man" brought to trial. Some say it was his hatred for Johnson that kept the flickering flame alight; a writer for the New York *Times* claimed that Old Thad was being fed on terrapin, English snipe, and hock. "That alone," he claimed, "is enough to live for."[6]

The Speaker

The other figure was that of Benjamin Franklin Butler, former major general in the United States Army and at present a Representative from the state of Massachusetts. He formed a strange contrast to the dying Stevens. During the Civil War, Colonel Theodore Lyman had written of Butler:

> With his head set immediately on a stout shapeless body, his very squinting eyes, and a set of legs and arms that look as if made for somebody else, and hastily glued to him by mistake, he presents a combination of Victor Emmanuel, Aesop, and Richard III, which is very confusing to the mind. Add to this a horse with a kind of rapid, ambling trot that shakes about the arms and legs, etc., till you don't feel quite sure whether it is a centaur, or what it is, and you have a picture of the celebrated General.[7]

This was the man, now dressed in white tie and swallow-tail coat, who

[4] *Harper's Weekly*, XII (April 11, 1868), 225-6.

[5] George W. Julian, MS. Diary, March 15, 1868. Quoted in Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), p. 182.

[6] New York *Times*, March 30, 1868.

[7] George R. Agassiz (ed.). Theodore Lyman, *Meade's Headquarters, 1863-1865* (Boston, 1922), p. 192.

was to open the case for the prosecution and who was to become, before the trial was over, the principal manager. Butler was no stranger to his immediate audience nor to the countless millions who, to a greater or lesser degree, were following the proceedings in both daily and weekly newspapers throughout the country. Almost everyone had a word to say about Ben Butler, sometimes irreverently known as "Old Squint-eye." A former Democrat who had joined the Radical Republicans and was later to run for President on the Greenback ticket, Butler had gained fame as the stern and not unsuccessful military commander of the occupied city of New Orleans during the Civil War. It was here that Butler hanged a man for destroying the United States flag. It was here in that same city that the "Beast" had remarked on observing a group of young ladies who turned their backs on him and threw out their skirts, "These women evidently know which end of them looks best."[8] The gold had tarnished, however, after Butler found himself and his thirty thousand badly needed troops bottled up at Dutch Gap in the Bermuda Hundreds just below Richmond by General Beauregard with ten thousand men. His reputation had not been improved, moreover, by basely false rumors that when he left New Orleans he had taken with him a quantity of silver spoons belonging to local residents or by the more than likely stories that while in New Orleans he increased his own financial resources by running contraband through enemy lines. Butler was picturesque—a man known to be at one and the same time charming, crafty, ruthless, colorful. This inconsistency in his character was perhaps the cause of widely divergent views about Butler's value to his country. For example, Abraham Lincoln had said of him that he "has my confidence in his ability and fidelity to the country and to me."[9] On the other hand, shortly before the trial, John Bingham, now chairman of the managers, had said, in a fit of rage, that one of Butler's statements made in the House "is only fit to come from a man who lives in a bottle and is fed with a spoon."[10] This was the man on whom all eyes were centered.

The Setting and Audience

Now the members of the House of Representatives were announced; and, as a Committee of the Whole and headed by the chairman, Washburne of Illinois, they entered the Senate Chamber and took their places on the brightly colored cane-seat chairs which had been placed in the rear of the Senators' desks. In a quiet voice, inaudible to many of those in the galleries, the Chief Justice said:

> Gentlemen, Managers of the House of Representatives, you will now proceed in support of the articles of impeachment. Senators will please give their attention.[11]

The New York *Tribune's* special correspondent now describes the scene:

> Gen. Butler arose. The galleries became hushed into breathless silence. Senators and Representatives leaned forward in their seats, anxious to hear every syllable of his exordium. Slowly advancing a few steps from the table, with a bunch of printed sheets in his hands, he bowed first to the Chief Justice and then to the Senate.[12]

[8] Benjamin F. Butler, *Butler's Book* (Boston, 1892), p. 416.

[9] Roy P. Basler (ed.), *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New Brunswick, 1953), VII, p. 207.

[10] *Congressional Globe*, 40th Congress, 1st Session, p. 364.

[11] *Congressional Globe*, 40th Congress, 2nd Session Supplement, p. 29.

[12] New York *Tribune*. Quoted in Detroit *Post*, April 3, 1868.

As Butler glanced around the Senate Chamber, he saw a room essentially the same as that occupied by the Senate today except for the ceiling, which was in that day pierced by skylights. Built shortly before the Civil War, the room, half again as long as it was wide, was relatively simple in arrangement and decoration. On the south side of the room, facing Butler, was a gallery for the diplomatic corps and for members of Senators' families; behind him in the north gallery was a raised section for members of the press. On each side, now filled with the elite of Washington society, were the public galleries.[13]

On the main floor were crowded fifty-four Senators and one hundred and ninety Representatives. There had been many changes in the composition of the Senate in the election in the previous year, all favorable to the Radical Republicans. Two Democrats had been defeated, reducing the Democrats to seven, only two of whom came from the North. The Johnson Republicans had been cut to four, and several of the Conservative Republicans had been replaced by more radical members. The Radical roll in the Senate was now forty-two. Of the fifty-four members, forty-four were lawyers, many of them eminent jurists—"men familiar with the tricks of the trade, and not only trained to distinguish between sophistry and logic, but qualified to know a lawyer from a limb of the law."[14] The House, particularly with respect to its leadership, was little changed from its composition in the 39th Congress. Representatives from ten southern states were absent, although those from Tennessee had been admitted.

Thus Butler's immediate audience was friendly although discerning; but Ben Butler must have had more than this audience in mind. He wished public support, for there was some feeling that, with Johnson impeached and Ben Wade made President, he might be appointed Secretary of State in the new cabinet. Favorable notices in the newspapers and magazines of the day would strengthen his position.

The Speech

In a sense, Butler had been preparing for this speech all his life. Although little formal rhetorical training had been included in his education, he read widely as a youth and was always ready to enter any conversation which promised a spirited argument. One of Butler's biographers points out that even in high school he was "already a good speaker" and that "he attended lyceum lectures [and] discussed current events with his chums."[15] At Waterville College (now Colby College) Butler was active in the Literary Society, eventually becoming president of that organization; abandoning study for the ministry, he concentrated on the arts and sciences, learning some rhetorical principles in his classes in Greek. Following his admission to the bar in 1840, Butler launched into a successful career as a criminal lawyer. At the same time he began his work in the political arena, taking part in the campaign for Martin Van Buren in 1840, and was never really out of politics from that moment on.

As to his immediate preparation, Butler tells the story himself:

> We [the committee] spent most of the morning over the question of selecting the chief manager. . . . That having been settled, I said: "But who is to make the opening argu-

[13] For an engraving of the Senate Chamber during the impeachment trial, see *Harper's Weekly*, XII (April 11, 1868), 232-3.

[14] Frederick T. Hill, *Decisive Battles of the Law* (New York, 1907), p. 165.

[15] Hans L. Trefousse, *Ben Butler* (New York, 1957), p. 20.

ment, and put the case in form for presentation? . . . There are less than three days in which to prepare it." There were not many candidates for the labor and I said: "Very well; I suppose as usual the opening of the case will fall upon the youngest counsel, and that is myself." . . . And thus I became the leading figure of the impeachment, for better or worse.

The three days devoted to the preparation of this case were three of the hardest labor of my life. Of those three days I used only nine hours to sleep, and I was working under many disadvantages. But I had a corps of faithful stenographers around me, and, fortunately, the Hon. William Lawrence, of Ohio, a man of a good deal of learning and industry, assisted me in getting together all the legal authorities bearing upon the subject.[16]

Butler's speech can be partitioned into the usual divisions of introduction, body, and conclusion. The introduction begins with a brief comment on the manager's imperfect role in the proceedings now before the Senate. Not only is this trial a momentous and significant occasion, Butler continues, but it has historical import as well. It is the first time a nation has brought its chief magistrate to trial; "in other times and other lands," those who are ruled must resort to revolution or assassination to rid themselves of a despot, of an imbecile, or a faithless ruler. This is not the case in the United States, where the founding fathers have spelled out very explicitly how and by whom the trial for impeachment shall be conducted. Only with respect to the crimes or offenses which are the "groundwork for impeachment" does the Constitution remain silent. And wisely so, says the principal manager, because "human foresight is inadequate . . . in the task of anticipating . . . all the infinite gradations of human wrong and sin by which the liberties of a people . . . may be endangered from the imbecility, corruption, and unhallowed ambition of its rulers."[17]

Butler contends that because of this silence it is necessary to define the term "impeachable crimes" before moving into the specific contentions of the prosecution. One must keep in mind at this point that the charges against Johnson were admittedly weak. As one authority has pointed out, "No man knew better than Benjamin F. Butler that the President had committed no offense deserving to be classed with treason and bribery."[18] It is true that the first eight articles of impeachment dealing with Johnson's removal of Stanton as Secretary of War without the consent of Congress might possibly come under the usual definition of impeachable crimes. But certainly the ninth article, charging that Johnson attempted to give direct orders to Major General Emory rather than transmit them through the General of the Army; the tenth article, suggested by Butler, charging that the President in his "swing around the circle" speeches had criticized Congress in harsh, intemperate language; and the eleventh article, proposed by Thaddeus Stevens, setting forth the fact that Johnson had opposed the execution of the reconstruction measures of Congress, could not be construed as treason under the ordinary definition of the word. With such a weak case, the only avenue open to the Board of Managers was to give themselves as free a hand as possible in the conduct of the case. This was done by stretching the definition of impeachable crimes to cover any act of the President with which the Radical Republicans chose to quarrel. An impeachable offense, Butler argues, is an act

[16] *Butler's Book*, p. 927-8.

[17] *Congressional Globe* Supplement, p. 29.

[18] David Miller Dewitt, *The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson* (New York, 1903), p. 408.

subversive of some fundamental principle of government or highly prejudicial to the public interest and may consist of any act, committed or omitted without violating a positive law, for an improper purpose. For support of this definition, Butler refers to the brief prepared by Rep. William Lawrence of Ohio which he offers to lay before the Senate at the conclusion of his opening speech. He then proceeds to answer in detail any objections which members of his audience might raise against such a broad interpretation. The first criticism is that some of the acts are not within the common-law definition of crimes. Although Butler answers by quoting from Hallam's *Constitutional History of England*, Christian's notes to the *Commentaries* of Blackstone, and Madison's debates in the First Congress, none of them, on close analysis, directly supports the prosecution's definition. The first two are obviously taken from a context widely different from the case now under consideration; Madison's statement can hardly be considered a legal precedent for the point under discussion.[19]

With this point out of the way, Butler now moves to the body of the speech, which can be divided into three propositions: (1) The Senate, in the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson, is sitting as a tribunal and not a court; (2) the President has, without authority, assumed the power of removing from office executive officers without the advice or approval of the Senate; (3) the President, primarily through certain speeches, has brought disgrace to his office. Under the second proposition Butler places the first eight articles of impeachment; and under the third proposition he places the ninth, tenth, and eleventh articles. Butler spends considerable time in his speech in support of the first proposition, this being necessary, he says, because "certain persons and papers . . . have endeavored . . . to prejudice the public mind . . . against the legal validity and propriety of the proceedings upon this trial."[20] Once more, realizing the inherent weakness of the Radical Republican's case against Johnson, the prosecutor is attempting to establish as broad a base as possible from which to operate, knowing full well that any restriction by court procedure would invalidate much of the evidence against Johnson. Butler's argument can be put in the form of a syllogism: All judicial courts have certain attributes; this body has none of those attributes; therefore, this body is not a judicial court. Butler now lists the attributes of a judicial court, i.e. (1) members of a court sit on oath or affirmation, (2) the person of the accused is sequestered and his personal appearance in court is required, (3) either of the parties may challenge any of the members of the court for favor, affinity, or interest. Butler admits that the members of this body sit on oath or affirmation but dismisses this fact by stating that this is mere form, a substitute for the British "obligation of honor." The second attribute he presents unsupported by any evidence or argument, leaving himself open to the counter argument that requiring the presence of the accused is not a necessary characteristic of a judicial body. As for the third attribute, Butler cites six cases in Parliament where members of the House of Lords who had a direct interest in the case were not subject to challenge and four similar cases tried before the Senate of the United States. Although this

[19] See Dewitt, p. 409-10.

[20] *Congressional Globe* Supplement, p. 31.

is the strongest argument in support of the first proposition, Butler's contention is valid only if one first of all accepts his assumption that the cases cited are examples of tribunals rather than courts. He makes no attempt, however, to support this crucial assumption.

Thus, according to Butler, the Senate was "bound by no law, either statute or common. . . . You are a law unto yourselves, bound only by the natural principles of equity and justice, and that *salus populi suprema est lex.*"[21]

The second proposition, that Johnson had removed an executive officer without the consent of Congress, is handled in a routine, prosaic manner. The eight articles are considered *seriatim;* since the acts contained in the articles themselves were not denied by the defense, Butler's only task is to show that such acts were unconstitutional and based on improper motives. Again, Butler's argument may be reduced to a syllogism: If the President has committed acts which are unconstitutional or arise from improper motives, he should be declared guilty; the acts contained in the first eight articles are unconstitutional and/or arise from improper motives; therefore the President should be declared guilty. The minor premise is supported largely by example and testimony, almost all of it taken from acts and debates of Congress. The burden of Butler's contentions is that Congress has, in the past, exercised the right to limit the powers of the President as they had recently in the Tenure of Office Act. He pointedly omits disclosing the fact, however, that since the time of Washington, Presidents have removed undesirable cabinet officers from their offices without securing the approval of the Senate.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

Passing quickly over the ninth article, Butler concentrates his fire on his own charge that Johnson, by his speech-making, brought the office of President into contempt, disgrace, and ridicule. The explication of this proposition brings about a noticeable change in the tenor of Butler's presentation. The New York *Times* notes that "his powers of invective, ridicule, and partisan fierceness were reserved for the pet creation of his own mind, the tenth article."[22] The Washington *Daily National Intelligencer* remarks that when Butler reached this article "his speech dwindled into a mere stump harangue, not devoid of ingenuity or point, but coarse, vindictive, and calculated, we believe, to disgust the more respectable and thoughtful portion of the Republican Senators."[23]

Butler amplifies his charge largely by means of example and narration. Comparing Johnson to Cromwell and Napoleon, Butler reminds his audience that "denunciatory attacks upon the Legislature have always preceded . . . a seizure by a despot of the legislative power of a country." "At the risk of being almost offensive," the prosecutor spells out in detail the events that occurred when Johnson gave his "swing around the circle" speeches at St. Louis and Cleveland. At the conclusion of this description Butler dramatically announces: "I can go no farther. I might follow this *ad nauseam.* I grant the President of the United States . . . the mercy of my silence."[24] Conscious of the foreign diplomats and correspondents of foreign newspapers seated in the galleries above him, Butler is almost carried away:

[22] New York *Times*, March 31, 1868.
[23] Washington *Daily National Intelligencer*, March 31, 1868.
[24] *Congressional Globe* Supplement, p. 40.

> What answer have you when an intelligent foreigner says, 'Look! See! . . . Is not our government a better one, where at least our sovereign is born a gentleman, than to have such a *thing* as this for a ruler?'
>
> Yes, we have an answer. We can say *this man* was not the choice of the people for the President of the United States. . . . By murder most foul, he succeeded to the Presidency, and is the elect of an assassin to that high office, and not of the people. 'It was a grievous fault, and grievously have we answered it'; but let me tell you, O advocate of monarchy! that our frame of government gives us remedy for such a misfortune, which yours, with its divine right of kings, does not. We can remove him . . . while your king, if he becomes a buffoon, or a jester, or a tyrant, can only be displaced through revolution, bloodshed, and civil war.[25]

Butler concludes the body of his speech with a brief discussion of the eleventh article of impeachment, that Johnson had obstructed the carrying out of the reconstruction measures of Congress. As proof of this article, the prosecutor offers the first ten articles, explaining that if these are deemed unlawful by the Senate, then the eleventh, which the President has already admitted, would automatically be unlawful.

The peroration is short and dramatic:

> Never again, if Andrew Johnson go quit and free this day, can the people of this or any other country by constitutional checks or guards stay the usurpations of executive power.
>
> I speak, therefore, not the language of exaggeration, but the words of truth and soberness, that the future political welfare and liberties of all men hang trembling on the decision of the hour.[26]

It is apparent that Butler depends for logical proof primarily on inductive reasoning supported by example, with occasional use of testimony and narration. Emotional proof appears sporadically, largely in support of the tenth article and in the peroration. Butler's appeals are primarily to such motives as (1) security, e.g. "Whoever, therefore, votes 'not guilty' on these articles votes to enchain our free institutions, and to prostrate them at the foot of any man who, being President, may choose to control them" and "Does any one doubt that if the intentions of the respondent could have been carried out . . . [it would have] lighted the torch of civil war?" (2) duty, e.g. "The responsibility is with you; the safeguards of the Constitution against usurpation are in your hands; the interests and hopes of free institution wait upon your verdict," and (3) respect, e.g. "Who can read the accounts of this exhibition . . . without blushing and hanging his head in shame as the finger of scorn and contempt for republican democracy is pointed at him?"

Butler's ethical proof stems from sources both within and without the speech. In his speech, his identification with such qualities as loyalty, integrity, and honesty, his constant references to British and American history, and his expressed concern for the welfare of the American people and the democratic way of life all tend to establish him, in the eyes of his immediate audience, as a man of character, intelligence, and good will.

Secondarily, his own standing as a military figure, a lawyer, and a politician enhanced this picture of him, at least for some of his audience. As Clemenceau remarks:

> Before the war, Mr. Butler was considered the most formidable lawyer in New England. Always ready with a retort, impossible to embarrass, bold to any length in attack, wily to an extreme in defense, he speaks simply and clearly, without too much rhetoric.[27]

Certainly such a reputation must have done much to command respect for

[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Ibid.*
[27] Fernand Baldensperger (ed.). Georges Clemenceau. *American Reconstruction, 1865-1870* (New York, 1928), p. 172.

Butler's wisdom, if not his integrity and benevolence.

Perhaps aware of his own reputation for flamboyancy, Butler seems deliberately to have begun his speech in a quiet, unhistrionic manner, as if by this almost paradoxical method of attack he could add weight and solemnity to his arguments. Indeed, he puts this thought into words when he closes his speech with the words, "I speak, therefore, not the language of exaggeration, but the words of truth and soberness." This may have been a calculated attempt to gain for himself good will, an attribute he did not always possess. Throughout his speech, Butler attempts to impress his audience with his innate fairness and sense of justice. Because the right of challenge does not apply to a tribunal, the Board of Managers will not question the right of a Senator of "near affinity" to the President [i.e. Reverdy Johnson] to sit upon the trial nor to question his right to express himself fully and openly on the innocence of the accused. Again, he is careful to explain that Andrew Johnson, as a private citizen, may say "what he pleases, in the manner he pleases" but that, as President of the United States, he must always observe "that fitness of conduct which is a part of his office." Butler constantly aligns himself with those qualities which are synonymous with the good, the true, the just. "He should be the living evidence of how much better, higher, nobler, and more in the image of God is the elected ruler of a free people than a hereditary monarch," and "Instead of a manly, straightforward bearing, claiming openly and distinctly the rights which he believed pertained to his high office, and yielding to the other branches, fairly and justly those which belong to them" are examples of the avowed alliance of the speaker with certain commendable qualities of character.

Delivery and Style

Butler read his speech from a "bundle of printed sheets" which, because of nearsightedness, he held close to his face. After delivering his opening statement "slowly . . . and in measured tones,"[28] he gradually increased his volume and rate of speaking. Although at all times conscious of the audience in the galleries, Butler for the most part addressed himself directly to the members of the Senate.

The general's voice was easily heard throughout the chamber; the quality of his voice, however, was the subject of some controversy and ridicule. The New York *Herald* reported that it "is the strangest ever mortal speaker saluted the public with. It resembles in its intonations the combined and varied noises of a cracked barrel organ and a chorus of bull terriers in a street fight—now sharp and snappish, and again wheezy and rasping."[29] The *Tribune* commented that at one portion of the speech, Butler "ground it out between his teeth like the screeching of a hundred saws, commingled with rumbling of an artillery carriage across a rugged pavement."[30]

Butler's use of notes undoubtedly limited his physical activity. What there was of it was evidently adequate to the occasion, for the *Tribune* concluded that "his gesture was effective and good."[31]

Although he had a reputation for picturesque, colorful language and a sharp tongue, Butler employed a style that was remarkable for its simplicity and plain-

[28] New York *Tribune*, March 31, 1868.
[29] New York *Herald*. Quoted in Detroit *Post*, April 3, 1868.
[30] New York *Tribune*, March 31, 1868.
[31] *Ibid.*

ness. Except in the discussion of his own article, he restricted himself to what the New York *Times* called a "dry, legal" argument and the *Herald* labelled a "dull, feeble effort." Most noticeable, perhaps, is his tendency to use appositive phrases in an effort to examine all facets of an idea. Such expressions as "the dignity of station, the propriety of position, the courtesies of office" and, again, "to analyze, to compare, to reconcile these precedents" are typical of Butler's style. This characteristic undoubtedly led to a feeling on the part of the immediate audience that the speech was ponderous, even verbose or, in the words of the New York *World* reporter, that it was not "luminous, but voluminous." Long sentences (his first seven sentences are all over forty words in length) strengthen the feeling of heaviness. On the other side of the ledger, however, is Butler's frequent use of example and illustration, his use of such elements of oral style as personal pronouns, questions, and parallel construction. Rarely does he employ metaphor, simile, or alliteration. Occasionally he bursts into inflamed passages which one observer felt "might be very effective in a stump speech, but are grossly offensive in a legal argument addressed to such a body as the Senate."[32]

In short, Butler's style was undistinguished except for its imbalance; it fluctuated between an excess of floridity and a paucity of devices which make for interest and directness of communication.

Effect

Accounts of the immediate effect of Butler's opening speech, as reported by eyewitnesses to the trial, varied depending upon the sympathies of the individual reporter and the paper he represented. The Washington correspondent for the Detroit *Advertiser and Tribune* comments: "There is but one opinion of Butler's opening argument . . . and it is that it was a masterly performance."[33] The New York *Tribune* pointed out that Butler "was eagerly listened to, and at many portions of his speech his audience hung upon his words in rapt attention."[34]

Others were not so kind, however. The New York *Herald* has this to say:

> For three mortal hours he bored the High Court of Impeachment with a harangue involving a wide range of subject which . . . had very little to do with the immediate question under consideration. The speech is spoken of, even by the admirers of Mr. Butler, as an excessively dull and feeble effort, far short of the great expectation placed upon it. . . . Toward 3 o'clock a large number of the spectators left, evidently exhausted and disappointed, and commenting upon the effort in not complimentary epithets.[35]

The reporter for the Washington *Evening Star* gave this somewhat lively description of at least part of Butler's audience:

> The Senators sat up quite primly at the commencement of the reading, but after two or three hours began to collapse. Senators Conness, Ramsey, Sumner, Fessenden, Morrill of Vt., Morgan, Cragin, Conkling, Howe, Frelinghuysen and Norton leaned their heads on their left hands. Senators Morton, Patterson of Tenn., Buckalow, Dixon, Doolittle, Edmunds, Anthony and Stewart ditto on their right mauleys, Senator Wilson suspended himself over his chair by his left arm. Senator McCreery turned a prodigious jack-knife end for end with great perseverance. Senator Fowler peeled an orange, and afterwards absorbed its juices with apparent relish. Messrs. Trumbull, Sherman, Grimes, Sprague, Headricks, Buckalow, Garrett Davis,

[32] New York *Times*. Quoted in Washington *Daily National Intelligencer*, April 1, 1868.

[33] Detroit *Advertiser and Tribune*, April 4, 1868.

[34] New York *Tribune*, March 31, 1868.

[35] New York *Herald*. Quoted in Detroit *Post*, April 3, 1868.

and Henderson slid forward in their chairs and sat on the small of their backs; and other Senators disposed themselves in various 'gin gout' attitudes and positions.[36]

The New York *World* commented that "it is of great length; it is the fruit of great labor; it is greatly wearisome; but it is not fitted to make a great impression."[37]

There remain to us a few evaluations of Butler's effort by persons who were not present at the opening speech. Gideon Welles, writing in his diary, remarked: "The intelligent Radicals do not seem satisfied with his performance, while the Democrats do not feel that Butler has made much headway against the President."[38] James G. Blaine felt that Butler had "opened the case against the President with circumspection and ability."[39] Georges Clemenceau, who was in Washington at the time as a young reporter for a French newspaper, was not present at the trial on the day Butler spoke. After reading Butler's opening presentation, he explained that it lacked the vitality of a speech. "This memoir, however," he continued, "is compiled with extreme care, and saying only what it sets out to say, says it clearly in every case. . . . The public in the galleries was perhaps a little disappointed, but the Senate was profoundly impressed."[40]

Ninety years have passed since Major-General Benjamin Butler rose to address the Senate in the impeachment of Andrew Johnson. Time has added little to Butler's qualities as a military figure and even less to his stature as a speaker. Looking back at the trial, one is impressed by two facts. First, the Radical Republicans, and more particularly the Board of Managers, were supporting a case that was basically indefensible. Second, Butler himself, although probably the most able of the managers, failed to take full advantage of the "available means of persuasion." In places, particularly with respect to his contention that the Senate was conducting not a trial but an inquest of office, his arguments were weak. His evidence was inadequate at times, irrelevant at other moments. His unadorned style, except when discussing the tenth article, and his uninspired delivery were not calculated to win to his side any in the audience who were apathetic or hostile toward the view of the Radical Republicans. Added to this was the fact that Butler was stalked by the ghost of his past deeds and reputation. They were not such as to add to the solemnity or the sincerity of the occasion. "It was singularly unfortunate that . . . Butler's own presence and participation served but to deepen the prevalent impression" that this was but a "hollow spectacle," "an insubstantial pageant."[41]

[36] Washington *Evening Star*, March 30, 1868.
[37] New York *World*. Quoted in Washington *Daily National Intelligencer*, April 1, 1868.
[38] Gideon Welles, *Diary of Gideon Welles* (Boston, 1911), III, p. 326.
[39] James G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress: From Lincoln to Garfield* (Norwich, Conn., 1886), II, p. 380.
[40] Baldensperger, p. 173.
[41] Dewitt, p. 407-8.

PREDICTING THE CONTENT OF SHORT PHRASES

John W. Black

THE reader or listener who is familiar with the language he is reading or hearing has a pretty good idea at any time during the reading or listening what words lie immediately ahead. This foreknowledge is not perfect, else the Pierian Spring could dry up and the reader or listener continue to get the messages as though the succeeding newsprint or sound waves were still emerging from the fount. Thus, at any instant in communication the next events are in part known and in part unknown; that is to say, there is a certain probability that they are known and a certain probability that they are unknown. The former probability is here designated *redundancy;* it indicates the degree of success with which the reader or hearer can be expected to predict the next unit in the communication on the basis of what has gone before. The latter probability, again employing the language of information theory, is designated *information;* that is, amount of information represents the degree of unpredictable freedom of the message sender in selecting the next unit of the communication.[1] Amount of information, in this sense, determines the degree of uncertainty the message receiver has about what the next unit of communication will be. The unit may be a letter, sound, word, or idea at the convenience of the investigator, provided the number of different possible responses is finite and he knows the number. Shannon found that individuals could guess the next letter in printed text with increasing accuracy as more of the preceding letters became known. With 99 letters known, 80 per cent of first guesses of successive letters were correct.[2] Data gathered in this manner contributed to his estimate that English is about 50 per cent redundant, a value that Chapanis questions as too high.[3] Information in this limited sense is of interest to students of speech; it provides a quantitative approach to an aspect of speech that is not well understood.

The purposes of the study reported here were (a) to find whether or not phrases that are typical of flight instruction (pilot training) and phrases from a newspaper can be predicted equally well by students who have not engaged in flying, (b) to find whether or not the degree to which the instructional phrases can be predicted is increased by an awareness of the source of the material; and (c) to find whether messages

Mr. Black (Ph.D., Iowa, 1935) is Professor of Speech and Director of Speech and Hearing Science at The Ohio State University and Editor of Speech Monographs. *This study was conducted at the U. S. Naval School of Aviation Medicine, N. A. S., Pensacola, Fla., under a contract between the Office of Naval Research and the Ohio State University Research Foundation.*

[1] C. E. Shannon and W. Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* (Urbana, Illinois, 1949).

[2] C. E. Shannon, "Prediction and entropy of printed English," *Bell System Technical Journal*, XXX (1951), 50-64.

[3] Alphonse Chapanis, "The Reconstruction of abbreviated printed messages," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XLVIII (1954), 496-510.

of more sounds and more words within a fixed length in syllables are predicted more readily than ones of fewer sounds and words. (In this context, the higher the prediction, i.e. the better the guessing, the greater the redundancy.) An alternative wording of the purpose could be, to estimate the amount of *information* (H) in each phrase under the circumstances of *a*, *b*, and *c*, immediately above, and to express the amount of information in *bits* ($H_{bits} = \log_2 N$, where N equals a finite number of alternative units available to the message sender, a formula that holds when all alternatives have an equal chance to occur).

1.

Two samples of printed language were collected: phrases from *Flight Patter*—the language of airborne flight instructors—and phrases from newspapers.[4, 5] Each phrase contained five syllables and three, four, or five words. From a pool of 300 of these five-syllable phrases from "flight patter," 64 were selected at random (examples: in such a way that; back to level flight; closer to the field). The phrases from newspapers were obtained by entering the fifth line of successive news stories and selecting the first five syllables that included no punctuation, proper nouns, or abbreviations and that comprised at least three words. From 200 phrases so selected, 64 were chosen at random (examples: here at a meeting; for twenty years the; the animals were). The similarity of the make-up of the two sets of phrases is suggested in the following summary:[6]

	Flight phrases	Newspaper phrases
Total phrases and total syllables	64; 320	64; 320
Length in typewriter spaces and median length in spaces	13-25; 19[7]	14-23; 19
Total words and number of different words	260; 140	240; 148
Total letters	1252	1201

Approximately 400 new students in the naval flight training program served as experimental subjects, each responding to four, five, or six phrases. One half (Group 1) were told the source of each phrase (newspaper or flight patter). The remainder (Group 2) were told that the phrases were "newspaper language."

The technique for estimating the information of a phrase was borrowed directly from Shannon. He treats printed English as using a 27-letter alphabet, the 26 orthographic letters of English and a space. He asks subjects to guess the successive letters of English text. The guessing may follow either of two sets of rules. Under both, the subject guesses the next letter of the text and is informed whether his prediction was right or wrong; then he either is apprised of the correct letter or, in the event the guess was wrong, is asked to guess again until the right response is made. In the present study a subject was permitted to continue guessing the next

[4] United States Navy Bureau of Aeronautics Training Division, *United States Navy Patter, Flight Maneuvers for Primary Training*, (1942).

[5] J. W. Black, "Timed Phrases," Kenyon Col. and U. S. Nav. Sch. Av. Med. Pensacola, Fla., 1948. *Technical Report SDC 411-1-5*.

[6] Similarities between this work and procedures followed by Frick in studying the language of the control tower are apparent. However, Frick's samples of language from newspapers and control towers were necessarily widely different in the numbers of types (different words). Cf. F. C. Frick, Progress report, Communications Research Division, Human Resources Research Laboratories, USAF, April, 1952; also F. C. Frick and W. H. Sumby, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXIV (1952), 595-596.

[7] Computations based on phrases of more than 21 spaces are not included, the number being too small to yield reliable values.

TABLE I

MEAN PERCENTAGE OF CORRECT FIRST GUESSES THROUGH 21 LETTERS AND SPACES FOR TWO KINDS OF TEXT; ALSO, AMOUNTS OF INFORMATION (H) PER SPACE.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
A. With more precise knowledge about source:																					
Flight Phrases																					
Correct first guesses (per cent)	11	39	47	52	56	47	59	58	61	52	47	61	64	59	61	69	71	69	71	66	82
H (bits)	4.0	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.8	3.0	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.2	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.2
Newspaper Phrases																					
Correct first guesses (per cent)	11	30	46	44	46	45	49	55	55	60	50	50	53	61	58	56	54	56	63	67	75
H (bits)	4.1	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.2	2.0	1.5
B. With less precise knowledge about source:																					
Flight Phrases																					
Correct first guesses (per cent)	10	36	52	50	53	48	62	59	57	55	50	58	60	61	49	64	63	64	60	61	72
Newspaper Phrases																					
Correct first guesses (per cent)	13	31	48	46	46	43	49	54	55	60	53	51	54	61	56	52	53	52	59	64	69

*Under both conditions of knowledge about source of material subjects were responding to the same flight phrases and the same newspaper phrases.

letter in the phrase through ten trials if necessary and then was told the letter if he had not guessed it.[8, 9] He kept records of his guesses and of the correct letters, and was told when the phrase ended.

Seven subjects responded to each phrase.

2.

The results that follow will show that success in predicting the successive letters of a phrase depends on (a) the kind of material presented to the subjects, (b) the instructions given them, and (c) the average lengths of the words and phrases.

Types of Materials. Table I presents data showing both the percentage of correct first guesses and the amount of information (bits) in the newspaper and flight phrases. A word about the construction of this table. The median length of the phrases was 19 typewriter spaces (supra). In other words 34 of the phrases were not more than 19 spaces in length. Table I summarizes the responses to the phrases through 21 typewriter spaces and ignores the few instances in which phrases extended through spaces 22, 23, 24, and 25. Obviously only 32 of the phrases were as many as 19 spaces long and the values of spaces 20 and 21 were based upon the responses to fewer than 32 phrases, not all 64 phrases. The values in spaces 1 to 13 (flight phrases) and 1 to 14 (newspaper phrases) were based upon the responses to all of the phrases, 64 phrases, seven responses to each. Space 7, in the upper half of Table I shows that 59 and 49 per cent of the letters in this space were guessed correctly on the first trial for flight and newspaper phrases respectively. This difference is reflected in the corresponding values of H. The greater uncertainty, 2.8 vs. 2.3 bits, was associated with the newspaper phrases.

In 16 of the 21 instances the information (H) was greater in newspaper phrases than in flight phrases. The difference in H per space can readily be computed: 4.1 minus 4.0; 3.3 minus 2.9; 3.0 minus 2.9; etc. The median difference among the 21 obtained values was approximately 1/3 bit.

Knowledge of the Source of the Material. Flight phrases, known to be such, were compared with similar phrases termed merely *newspaper language*. The percentages of correct first guesses under these two categories are included in Table I, part A being based on relatively precise knowledge about the source and part B on less precise knowledge.

The first guesses were more frequently correct when the subjects were aware that the phrases were flight patter. The mean advantage through 21 spaces of knowing that flight phrases were such and not newspaper phrases was 3½ per cent. The two sets of data were essentially the same through the first half of the spaces and then diverged.

[8] In the computation of the average entropy per space the "incorrect responses after 10 trials" were distributed evenly among trials 10-20, the latter being representative of Shannon's empirically determined terminal guesses. The magnitudes of the "incorrect responses after 10 trials" were comparable to Shannon's proportion of guesses that exceeded ten.

[9] In the context of speech and hearing the predicting of succeeding sounds instead of orthographic letters might seem preferable. A phonetic alphabet was used in a pilot study and found to be feasible. However, when the experimental subjects who were using it and ones who were responding in orthographic letters were asked to "explain their guesses," all couched their explanations in terms of the *words* that were being guessed. Thus, the person who guessed the terminal "event" in the phrase *in such a way that* might say the letter *t* or the sound [t]; in either instance he was spelling the word he had in mind, *that*. The ease of handling the orthographic alphabet outweighed other considerations that favored using a phonetic approach.

Predictability of Units of Different Length and Position. Shannon observed that "the prediction gradually improves, apart from some statistical fluctuation, with increasing knowledge of the past as indicated by the larger number of correct first responses."[2]

The initial letter of a phrase was guessed correctly in ten per cent of the instances. Had the subjects followed a table of the relative frequency of initial letters in words, all the first guesses would have been the letter *t*, the initial letter in 18.2 per cent of words in written English. This knowledge of the relative frequency of initial letters was available to Shannon's subjects which led him to accord them the score, 18.2 per cent for the first letter of a passage. Similar knowledge was not available to Frick's subjects; they earned the same score as the present ones.

Table I shows that the subjects guessed the second letter one time in three. Correctness of the first guesses increased in the manner stated by Shannon. In fact, this correctness increased until it might be said to exceed two "hits" out of three chances within a single line of newsprint. More and more of what has gone before affects prediction to the extent that 76 per cent of the first guesses of the terminal letters of the phrases were correct.

With a longer unit, either a word or a phrase, the average prediction score for the component letters was improved over the score that attended shorter units. The phrases contained from three to five words. First guesses per letter throughout 3-word phrases were 50 per cent correct; four-word phrases, 52 per cent; and five-word phrases, 56 per cent. Table II shows the mean number of correct first guesses per letter for words of different numbers of letters. As a rule, the longer the word, the better the prediction, but four-letter words, an exception, were consistently more difficult to predict than three-letter words.

The columns of Table II show that the successive words of a phrase were more accurately predicted—letter by letter—than the preceding words.

3.

A technique for predicting the letters of English writing was applied to five-syllable phrases from newspapers and from flight instructions. Young men who were entering the naval pilot training program and who were unfamiliar with flight procedures predicted the letters of flight phrases more easily than newspaper phrases. When the flight phrases were called "newspaper language" the flight phrases were less predictable than otherwise but remained more predictable than newspaper phrases.

The initial letter of a phrase was predicted with 10 per cent success and the final letter with 75 per cent success. A higher probability of knowing the next letter distinguished longer units from shorter units, either words or phrases.

TABLE II

MEAN PERCENTAGES CORRECT FIRST GUESSES PER LETTER OF THE FIRST, SECOND, . . . FIFTH WORDS IN PHRASES, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO THE LENGTHS OF THE WORDS. NUMBER OF WORDS IN EACH CATEGORY INDICATED IN PARENTHESES. TYPES OF MATERIAL POOLED.

	Length of the Word in Letters						
Position in Phrase:	1-2	3	4	5	6	7-10	Weighted mean
First Word	.17 (43)	.41 (27)	.38 (19)	.43 (14)	.44 (8)	.45 (20)	.24
Second Word	.30 (30)	.51 (29)	.41 (30)	.44 (11)	.47 (8)	.46 (18)	.32
Third Word	.42 (21)	.49 (27)	.44 (34)	.47 (17)	.46 (10)	.56 (20)	.37
Fourth Word	.41 (9)	.55 (20)	.48 (22)	.54 (21)	.59 (9)	.56 (13)	.52
Fifth Word	.83 (3)	.60 (6)	.59 (9)	.70 (6)	.74 (1)	—	.65
Weighted Mean	.30	.49	.44	.50	.50	.50	

JOHN P. ALTGELD ON ORATORY

Huber W. Ellingsworth

IN the hungry and highly competitive market for speech textbooks, successful sales are numbered in thousands of copies. Some popular titles have gone through three or more editions. Yet there is one theory of rhetoric, largely overlooked by contemporary rhetoricians, which has surpassed all the well-known texts in gross sales. Published in 1901, it has been in print to the present without revision, has had three publishers, and has sold upwards of 320,000 copies. This book, by John Peter Altgeld, has appeared variously under the titles *Oratory*, *Oratory: Its Requirements and Its Rewards*, and *Hints on Public Speaking*. After its publication by Walter Kerr in 1901, the book was brought out again in 1915 by the Public Press, a now-defunct Chicago concern, and was added in 1920 to the Haldeman-Julius "Little Blue Book" series, in which it has enjoyed by far its greatest volume.[1] Its brevity—64 pages in the original edition—and its sale price, ranging from fifty cents to five cents, have doubtless been contributing factors in its popularity. Yet the interest of publishers and the volume of sales indicate an inherent value for the book.

The contents are a distillation of 30 years of Altgeld's experience in American public life. Altgeld was successively a farm laborer, a Civil War recruit, an itinerant railroad worker, and a school teacher before he settled in a Chicago law career in 1875. Shortly after his arrival in Chicago he became active in politics, an interest which was to make him Governor of Illinois in 1892 and a controversial national figure. It was his pardoning in 1893 of the so-called Haymarket Anarchists, Samuel Fielden, Oscar Neebe, and George Schwab, which first brought him to the center of national attention. In 1894 he was again in the headlines through his defiance of President Grover Cleveland over the use of federal troops in the Pullman Company strike in Chicago. Partly as a result of this feud and partly through his conviction that free silver was a key to greater prosperity, Altgeld gained the leadership of the Democratic party from President Cleveland in 1895 and prepared to name his own candidate, Richard Bland, for the 1896 presidential nomination. His plans were disrupted by William Jennings Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech, which won the nomination for the youthful Nebraskan. Altgeld campaigned for Bryan, however, in 1896 and again in 1900. Though not a successful candidate for office after 1892, Altgeld remained politically active until his death in 1902.

Early in his career he declared oratory to be his "first love," and through the years he searched libraries for books which would help him speak better. He found none which satisfied him, and so determined to write one himself.[2] In

Mr. Ellingsworth (Ph.D., Florida State, 1955) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics at Michigan State University.

[1] Henry Haldeman-Julius indicates in a letter to the writer that 321,500 copies were printed, of which approximately 321,000 have been sold. No records remain of the publication and sale figures of the other two publishers.

[2] Harry Barnard, *Eagle Forgotten* (New York, 1938), p. 431.

1900, near the end of his career, he completed the project. The author thought highly of his effort, to judge from his evaluation of it as "something that will live after me. It will be remembered long after everything I did in politics is forgotten."[3] His opinion was shared by Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War in the Wilson Administration, who called the work "a classic."[4]

The basic concept of the book is that oral discourse may be divided into two categories, "Oratory" and "Utilitarian Talk." Oratory he visualizes as an exalted art requiring so much labor and dedication as to be beyond the capacity of almost all speakers. Oratory, he believes, is composed of the mastery of knowledge, arrangement of materials, language, and delivery. "The ideas must be bright and seem alive. The language must be chaste and expressive. The arrangement must be logical, natural, and effective. The delivery requires as much attention to voice and action as is given by a singer."[5]

The influence of Quintilian is evident in his declaration of the necessity for knowledge: "The orator must have a general knowledge of history, of literature, of religion, of the sciences, of human nature, and of world affairs. He must present new ideas, or old ideas in a new light, and they must be lofty ideas, that appeal to the nobler sentiments of men."[6]

There is a mystical quality in his attitude toward oratory, as indicated by these excerpts: "Mind must commune with mind and soul with soul or there is no oratory." "Elevation of thought produces elevation of language." "Studying the stars and contemplating nature prepare the soul for great things." "No man can rise to the heights of oratory unless his soul is on fire." "Oratory is the masculine of music." Altgeld sees Demosthenes as the supreme orator and commends him to the ambitious student.[7]

While oratory is the most laudable form of expression, Altgeld observes, below it lies the great realm of "utilitarian talk." This level of communication is what gets the world's work done in politics, business, and religion. The author urges his readers to cultivate the elements of oratory to a point where they can lift their "utilitarian talk" to the level of oratory.

Despite his apparent emphasis on the exalted and abstract qualities of pure oratory, Altgeld dwells extensively on practical matters for the everyday speaker. A good portion of this practical material is devoted to the improvement of voice and diction. The singer is the model for the speaker here. Deep inhalation, tone placement at the roof of the mouth, and careful articulation are necessary. A daily regimen of five minutes of deep breathing and half an hour of musical scales is demanded. The test of breath economy is holding a lighted candle before the mouth and preserving the flame while running the scale.

Turning to the subject of speech preparation, Altgeld quotes Quintilian as stating, "In writing are the roots; in writing are the foundations of eloquence." Writing speeches has a number of values, Altgeld feels. It displays the limits of one's knowledge on a subject early in the preparation period; it brings to light the organization, and by

[3] Interview quoted in *Chicago Evening American*, December 10, 1919.

[4] Allan Nevins, ed., *Letters and Journal of Brand Whitlock* (New York, 1936), p. xxxi.

[5] John P. Altgeld, *Hints on Public Speaking* (Boston, 1887).

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-18.

the third writing it fixes ideas in the speaker's mind. Should speeches then be read from the platform or memorized? Emphatically no, say Altgeld. Yet the writing has given the speech a structure and style which will not be lost in the heat of delivery, even though the speaker does not use a single sentence exactly as it is written.

Altgeld is acutely conscious of what he calls "the breakfast table audience." This group, sometimes numbering millions, reading the efforts of a prominent speaker over the morning coffee, is perhaps more vital than the smaller numbers in the listening audience. It is also for them that speech must be written down. Poor light, bad acoustics, and newspaper deadlines, he feels, greatly lessen the possibility of accuracy in on-the-spot coverage, and a manuscript should be filed with newsmen before the speech.[8] Writing the speech also increases greatly the possibility that it will have "literary eloquence," and be worth preserving. "It was literary eloquence," Altgeld declares, "that saved the great speeches of antiquity."

Like Quintilian, Altgeld stresses abstemiousness and self-control as the keys to preserving physical strength. Alcohol must be avoided before and during a speech, but at the conclusion, when there is danger of taking cold, "a little stimulant may be taken to advantage." Drinking water while speaking is as injurious to the throat as alcohol. There are still other ways of damaging the voice. "Never wrap or muffle the neck when out of doors for this opens the pores and exposes to cold." Handshaking and hospitality, however pleasant, are a drain on the vitality in an extended speaking tour. A bleak hotel room is preferable to the home of a friend, because it forestalls social engagements. The speaker must remember that "Isolation is the price of greatness" and must observe training rules as carefully as a prizefighter.[9]

As for appearance in public, Altgeld says, the speaker must never appear in a fashionable new suit, lest he be thought a dandy, or in disreputable garb, because he may be considered careless and slovenly. Either extreme shifts the attention of the audience from what he is saying.

Altgeld feels that it is very easy for a speaker to lose awareness of how well he is speaking. "It would greatly increase the reputation of every speaker and help his cause . . . if he could be accompanied by a severe critic who would carefully note his delivery and afterwards require him to rehearse those parts that were not well delivered."[10]

In keeping with his emphasis on the spiritual nature of oratory, the writer considers the ethics of public discourse. The would-be orator must at all times place himself in the service of the "masses who are doing the world's work and making civilization possible." He believes that "all the great speeches ever delivered were protests against injustice and appeals for the public welfare." "Sincerity and intense earnestness are the essence of oratory. The orator must be absolutely independent, even though he has neither bread to eat nor shoes to wear."[11]

The present and future of oratory look bright to the author. The newspapers have added millions to a speaker's potential audience and the continued rise of the status of women has increased the numbers of intelligent listeners. Oratory, he feels, begets

[8] A common enough practice in the mid-twentieth century.

[9] Altgeld, pp. 11-14.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

oratory. A speaker can reach his maximum potential only in debate with others of equal or superior ability. Among the ancients, Pericles, Demosthenes, and Cicero were whetted by the quality of their opposition. Pitt, Chatham, Fox, Sheridan, Patrick Henry, and Samuel Adams had worthy opponents. To Altgeld, the golden period of American oratory was the time when Webster, Clay, and Calhoun strode the Senate Chamber. And as for Altgeld's own time," No age in the world's history ever offered such allurements to ambition, or such a field of usefulness as this age offers to the orator." Like Pericles' heroes, "He can write his epitaph in the hearts of men, and have the whole world for a sepulchre."[12]

It is inevitably of interest to the speech critic to know Altgeld's thoroughness as a practitioner of his rhetorical theory. The theme of his principle of invention, as noted above, was broad knowledge. In his speeches he displayed a considerable knowledge of history and often utilized historical analogies. He appears to have been a particular student of the early history of the American republic, to judge from his frequent references to Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson. There are also traces of a literary interest, displayed through Biblical quotations and stanzas of poetry, some from James Russell Lowell. Despite an almost total lack of formal education, Orator Altgeld displays a breadth of knowledge probably satisfactory to Rhetorician Altgeld.

The simple treatment of arrangement in *Oratory* stresses a heavy weight of statistical and historical evidence at the beginning. From this foundation arguments may be drawn. These arguments should be arranged in a pattern of climax, with the strongest last. On this point practitioner Altgeld was squarely in accord with his principles. His speeches seldom varied from such a procedure.

On some matters relating to delivery, also, there is a high correlation between his theory and practice. Altgeld is an advocate of the restrained "natural" delivery. Gestures must be used sparingly, if at all. The only available account of his gestures indicates that he was far from flamboyant: "He spoke . . . for two hours and twenty minutes to a crowded audience of about five thousand people. He made but one gesture and rarely raised his voice."[13]

Rhetorician Altgeld was convinced of the desirability of a pure, mellow tone of voice, achieved through singing and breathing exercises. Perhaps this is because, as one observer described it, his voice was "harsh, sometimes shrill and sibilant."[14]

However strongly Altgeld felt about the necessity for a critical auditor who would help the speaker maintain a perspective and correct his mistakes, he was very sensitive about his speaking and brooked no criticism—except from his wife, whom he accepted and respected as a critic.[15] Her delicate health and the fullness of his speaking schedule suggest that she probably could not have served this critical function on many occasions.

It was in the realm of abstemiousness and self-denial that Altgeld fell widest of the standards he set up. He called for reservation in eating and drinking and demanded a maximum of sleep for his ideal orator. Hospitality and handshak-

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] Barnard, p. 68.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[15] Interview with William Hinricksen, *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, March 16, 1902.

ing must be rejected so that the speaker might conserve his strength, he said. Yet for all these admonitions, Altgeld could not resist his social instincts. Even when chronic disease weakened him, he seldom refused the blandishments of dancing and rich foods. Describing his term as governor, Barnard says that night after night he spent in "shaking hands, consuming banquet food, making and listening to fatuous speeches, and in dancing."[16] He was distinguished on the dance floor and also at the dining table. Two dozen oysters were a common appetizer[17] and his meals were seldom ended without at least two pieces of pie.[18] On the day of his death he was ill and had argued all day in court without lunch. He was scheduled to speak that evening in Joliet and on the train bolted a large steak and the inevitable pie. Twelve hours later he was dead of a cerebral hemorrhage. An impoverished childhood and a destitute youth had given him a taste for luxury which he could never appease.

What has Altgeld, the exacting theorist and adequate practitioner, to say to the teacher and student of public speaking in the mid-twentieth century? Probably little that is new about logical proof or audience adaptation. If he has a message for contemporary times, it concerns the dignity and worth of the speaker and the impressive responsibility which he bears for advancing the cause of humanity. The emphasis of twentieth-century speech training is on what Altgeld calls "utilitarian talk," not on the heroic role of the orator. To the speech teacher preoccupied with rating blanks, outlines, and one-point speeches, Altgeld brings a refreshing reminder that *ethos* may after all be the most significant part of the rhetorical discipline.

[16] Barnard, p. 165.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 166.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 434.

* * *

THE FORUM

REVISED CONSTITUTION
October 1959

The Constitution as printed below incorporates all amendments to the Constitution and to the By-Laws adopted between December 1954 and May 1959.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

ARTICLE I

Name

The name of this educational, non-profit corporation shall be Speech Association of America.

ARTICLE II

Purposes

The Association is dedicated to the study of speech as an instrument of thought and of social cooperation, to the promotion of high standards in the teaching of the subject, to the encouragement of research and criticism in the arts and sciences involved in improving the techniques of speech, and to the publication of related information and research studies.

ARTICLE III

Membership

Membership in the Association shall be open, upon application, to any person, or any organized group of persons, interested in promoting its purposes.

ARTICLE IV

Funds of the Association

Section 1. Funds of the Association shall be classified as Current Funds, Investment Funds, and Trust Funds.

Section 2. Current Funds shall include all annual dues of members, all receipts from publications, and all other funds received in the continuing operations of the Association.

Section 3. Investment Funds shall include all gifts and bequests received without special restrictions concerning the use to be made of the principal and income and such other funds as may be designated by the Administrative Council as Investment Funds.

Section 4. Trust Funds shall consist of all life-membership dues, all contributions, all gifts, and all bequests accepted with specific restrictions prohibiting their allotment either to Current or to Investment Funds.

Section 5. The deposit, investment, and disbursement of all funds shall be subject to the direction of the Administrative Council.

ARTICLE V

Officials of the Association

Section 1. The functions of the Association shall be discharged through its officers, editors, councilors, and legislators.

Section 2. The officers shall be: President, Executive Vice-President, First Vice-President, Second Vice-President, and Executive Secretary.

Section 3. The editors shall be the editors of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *Speech Monographs*, and *The Speech Teacher*.

Section 4. The councilors shall be the members of the Administrative Council.

Section 5. The legislators shall be the members of the Legislative Assembly.

ARTICLE VI

Duties of Officers

Section 1. The President shall preside at all meetings of the Administrative Council, at all joint meetings of the Administrative Council and the Legislative Assembly, and at meetings of the Association if he deems such meetings necessary or desirable for the good of the Association; upon consultation with the Second Vice-President and the Executive Secretary shall appoint the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly for a term of three years; shall appoint such temporary committees as he thinks necessary for the efficient management of the affairs of the Association during his term of office; in the event of the disability, death or resignation of the Executive Vice-President, the Executive Secretary, or the Editor of any of the publications, he [the President] shall appoint a special nominating committee to name a member to fill the unexpired term, the nomi-

nation to be approved by the Administrative Council by mail ballot; shall receive the annual reports of the officers, of the committees of the Association, and of the Interest Groups in advance of the annual meeting and shall make these reports available to members of the Administrative Council and of the Legislative Assembly; and shall perform such other duties as may be delegated to him by the Administrative Council and by the Legislative Assembly.

Section 2. The Executive Vice-President shall assist the President in the performance of his duties, shall act as a liaison representative between this Association and other associations and agencies whose activities are related to the field of speech, shall promote the professional interests of the Association through the maintenance of helpful relationships with such organizations, and shall assist in coordinating the committees of the Association, especially those committees whose activities extend over a period of two years or more.

Section 3. The First Vice-President shall prepare the program for the annual meeting with the assistance of the Vice-Chairmen of the Interest Groups. On the occasion of the President's disability or absence he shall perform the duties of the President. On the occasion of the disability or absence of the First Vice-President, the Second Vice-President shall perform the duties of the First Vice-President. On the occasion of the disability or absence of both the First Vice-Presidency to be voted upon by the dent, if such occasion occurs not later than four months before the annual meeting, the nominating committee chosen at the preceding annual meeting shall nominate a candidate for the First Vice-Presidency to be voted upon by the Administrative Council by mail ballot. If such occasion occurs within four months of the annual meeting, the President, after consultation with the Executive Vice-President and the Executive Secretary, shall appoint a First Vice-President.

Section 4. The Second Vice-President shall serve as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and shall perform whatever specific duties may be assigned to him by the President, by the Administrative Council, or by the Legislative Assembly. He shall report the actions of the Administrative Council to the Legislative Assembly. On the occasion of the disability or the absence of both the President and the First Vice-President, he shall perform the duties of the President. On the occasion of the disability or the absence of the First Vice-President, he shall perform the duties of the First Vice-President. On the occasion of the disability or absence of the Second Vice-President, or on his assumption of the duties of a higher officer, the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly shall perform the duties of the Second Vice-President until the Administrative Council shall elect a Second Vice-President.

Section 5. The Executive Secretary shall perform the usual duties of secretary, treasurer, and business manager. He shall serve as Director of the Placement Service. He shall serve ex officio as a member of the Finance Committee. In accordance with provisions set up by the Administrative Council, he shall be custodian of all Association Funds. He shall be responsible for the administration of the approved budget, shall prepare an annual financial report to the Association, and shall advise with all officers, with committee chairmen, and with Interest Group Chairmen of the Association in matters involving their business transactions. He shall prepare, distribute, and tally official ballots for voting on candidates for offices in the Association, on members for the Administrative Council, on delegates for the Legislative Assembly, on members for the Nominating Committee, and on amendments to the Constitution. He shall prepare the list of official delegates to the Legislative Assembly.

Section 6. All officers shall submit budget requests to the Finance Committee prior to December 1 or at the request of the Finance Committee, shall consult with the Executive Secretary on all business policies and transactions, and shall consult with the Executive Vice-President on all professional and educational matters pertaining to the Association.

Article VII

Duties of Editors

Section 1. The Editors of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *Speech Monographs*, and *The Speech Teacher* shall each select his editorial staff and shall perform the other duties of an editor-in-chief.

Section 2. The Editors shall submit budget requests to the Finance Committee prior to December 1 or at the request of the Finance Committee.

Article VIII

The Administrative Council

Section 1. The Administrative Council shall consist of: the President, the Executive Vice-

President, the First and Second Vice-Presidents, the Executive Secretary, the Editor of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, the Editor of *Speech Monographs*, and the Editor of *The Speech Teacher* for the terms of their respective offices; the immediate past Editors of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, of *Speech Monographs*, and of *The Speech Teacher*; the three immediate past Presidents; the immediate past Executive Vice-President; the immediate past Executive Secretary; the members of the Finance Committee; and six members elected at large, two each year for a term of three years.

Section 2. Regular meetings of the Administrative Council shall be held each year at the time and place of the annual meeting of the Association. Other meetings may be called by the President, or on petition of one-third of the members of the Administrative Council.

Section 3. The Administrative Council shall serve as the legal representative of the Association to have, to hold, and to administer all property and funds, and to manage the affairs of the Association; shall receive and act upon the recommendations of the Finance Committee and the Project Committees; shall receive the report of the Committee on Committees; shall confirm the membership of the Association committees authorized by and responsible in whole or in part to the Administrative Council; shall receive and act upon recommendations concerning administrative matters from the Consultation Committee, the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards, the Committee on Publications, the Committee on Public Relations, and the Committee on Time and Place; shall fill vacancies on committees when they occur; shall allocate the finances of the Association; shall elect the Executive Vice-President and the Executive Secretary; shall provide for official publications, shall elect the editors thereof and shall have the right to copyright convention papers, reports or special publications; shall direct all public relations of the Association; shall determine the time and place of the annual meeting and convention; shall approve the initiation of projects of the Association; shall consider liaison problems relative to the administration of the Association; shall recognize regional and national associations and federations for representation in the Legislative Assembly and state associations for the right to nominate candidates for representatives of geographical areas; shall receive the petitions of prospective Interest Groups; shall vote upon granting to these Groups official status in the Association and shall report the action taken on each petition to the Legislative Assembly; shall hear and act upon charges brought against any member; and annually shall elect one member of the Association to serve on the Nominating Committee.

Section 4. The Administrative Council shall be the ultimate authority on all matters relating to the Association in the periods between annual meetings; it shall administer the policies established by the Legislative Assembly and shall conduct the affairs of the Association, except as otherwise provided in the Constitution and in the By-Laws; its decisions between annual meetings, however, shall be subject to revision by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Legislative Assembly present at any annual meeting of the Association.

Section 5. After the annual budget prepared and recommended by the Finance Committee has been presented and considered in a joint session of the Administrative Council and the Legislative Assembly, the Administrative Council shall act upon the recommended budget and shall adopt a budget for the ensuing year.

Article IX

The Legislative Assembly

Section 1. The Legislative Assembly shall be a representative body composed of the following members of the Speech Association of America: (1) ninety members elected at large, thirty each year for a term of three years; (2) forty-eight members elected from four geographical areas, on ballots cast by members of the Association resident in the respective areas, sixteen each year (four from each area) for a term of three years from candidates recommended to the Nominating Committee by regional and state associations and/or other candidates proposed by the Nominating Committee; (3) a representative of each Interest Group; (4) the Presidents and Executive Secretaries or designated representatives of the following regional associations: the Speech Association of the Eastern States, the Central States Speech Association, the Southern Speech Association, the Western Speech Association, and the Pacific Speech Association; (5) one member chosen for a term of one year by each of the following national organizations: the American Speech and Hearing Association, the American Educational Theatre Association, the National Society for the Study of Communication, the American Forensic Association, and by

other associations or federations that may hereafter be recognized by the Administrative Council and by the Legislative Assembly; (6) the Second Vice-President-Elect from date of certification of election by the Executive Secretary until date of elevation to office of Second Vice-President.

Section 2. The Legislative Assembly shall establish the policies of the Association; shall receive and act upon the recommendations of the Interest Groups and of the committees of the Assembly; shall meet jointly with the Administrative Council to receive and consider the reports of the Finance Committee and the Committee on Time and Place; shall elect three representatives to serve on the Committee on Committees; shall receive the report of the Committee on Committees; shall confirm the membership of the Association committees authorized by and responsible in whole or in part to the Legislative Assembly; shall receive reports and act upon recommendations of the Consultation Committee, the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards, the Committee on Publications, the Coordinating Committees, the Service Committees, and the Study Committees; shall receive the reports of the Committee on Public Relations and of the Project Committees; and annually shall elect one member of the Nominating Committee of the Association.

Section 3. The standing committees of the Legislative Assembly shall be the Committee on Credentials, the Committee on Resolutions, and the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Credentials shall be composed of a chairman and four other members of the Legislative Assembly, to be nominated by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Legislative Assembly. The Committee on Credentials shall receive from the Executive Secretary the list of official delegates and shall certify these delegates by issuing official badges entitling them to the floor of the Assembly. The Committee on Resolutions shall be composed of a chairman and four other members of the Legislative Assembly, to be nominated by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Legislative Assembly. The Committee on Resolutions shall draft resolutions and, with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, shall present resolutions to the Legislative Assembly. It shall receive for consideration and possible presentation as resolutions to the Assembly proposals from individual members and/or groups in the Association, or by referral, proposals from the Legislative Assembly, from the Executive Committee of the Legislative Assembly, from the Interest Groups, from Committees of the Association, and/or from the Administrative Council. The Committee on Rules shall be composed of the Parliamentarian as Chairman, the Speaker, the Clerk, and two other members of the Executive Committee appointed by the Speaker. It shall formulate and recommend to the Assembly procedures which relate to such matters as definitions of functions and methods of keeping actions in harmony with the letter and intent of the Constitution and By-Laws.

Section 4. The Legislative Assembly shall meet at the time and place of the annual meeting of the Association, and shall hold its major sessions prior to the convention program.

Section 5. The officers of the Assembly shall be the Speaker who shall be the Second Vice-President of the Association, a Clerk who shall be appointed for a term of three years by the President of the Association in consultation with the Second Vice-President and the Executive Secretary, and a Parliamentarian who shall be nominated by the Executive Committee and elected by the Assembly for a term of three years. The duties of the Speaker, the Clerk, and the Parliamentarian shall be those usually performed by such officers.

Section 6. The members of the Executive Committee of the Assembly shall be the Speaker, the Clerk, the Parliamentarian, the Second-Vice-President-Elect, the Presidents of the regional associations or their authorized representatives; the representatives of the following national organizations: American Speech and Hearing Association, American Educational Theatre Association, the National Society for the Study of Communication, the American Forensic Association, and of other associations or federations that may hereafter be recognized by the Administrative Council and by the Legislative Assembly; eight representatives of geographical areas, elected by the Assembly, four each year for a term of two years; and four representatives of the Interest Groups, elected by the Assembly, two each year for a term of two years. The Executive Committee shall prepare the agenda for the annual meeting of the Assembly; shall review and approve, amend, or disapprove the resolutions drafted by the Committee on Resolutions; shall carry out the instructions of the Assembly; shall nominate the Parliamentarian of the Assembly; shall re-

port the actions of the Assembly to the Administrative Council; shall act upon proposals in Interest Groups concerning projects, services, questionnaires, and meetings between conventions; and shall fill vacancies on Assembly Committees when they occur.

Article X

Interest Groups

Section 1. To facilitate the achievement of the purposes stated in Article II and to aid in the planning of the convention program, Interest Groups shall be organized within the Association.

Section 2. The following Interest Groups and others may be formed as provided in Article V, Section 1 through 5 of the By-Laws: (a) Rhetoric and Public Address, (b) Forensics, (c) Discussion, (d) Communication, (e) Oral Interpretation of Literature, (f) Theatre, (g) Radio, Television, and Films, (h) Linguistic Science and Phonetics, (i) Semantics, (j) Speech Science and Psychology, (k) Speech and Hearing Disorders, (l) Speech Education, (m) Speech in the Elementary School, (n) Speech in the Secondary School, (o) Speech in the Colleges and Universities, (p) Speech in Adult Education, (q) Speech in the Seminaries. Any national association that has met with the Speech Association of America at a past annual meeting may request the Administrative Council to approve that association as the agency sponsoring the related Interest Group.

Section 3. The affairs of an Interest Group shall be conducted by a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman, a Secretary, and an Advisory Committee of three members.

Section 4. The Chairman shall serve for one year. He shall preside at the annual business meeting of the Interest Group at which officers, committee members, and a delegate to serve in the Legislative Assembly shall be elected, shall report to the Administrative Council the activities of the Group, shall present recommendations requiring action by the Council, and shall report to the Group actions of the Council affecting the Group.

Section 5. The Vice-Chairman shall serve for one year and shall succeed to the chairmanship in the following year. After consultation with the other officers and with the members of the Advisory Committee, he shall assist and be responsible to the First Vice-President of the Association in planning the convention program for his Interest Group. He shall report to the Legislative Assembly the activities of the Group, and shall present recommendations requiring action by the Assembly. On the occasion of the Chairman's disability or absence, he shall perform the duties of the Chairman.

Section 6. The Secretary who shall serve for one year shall perform the usual duties of secretary and shall keep the Advisor to Interest Groups informed concerning the activities of the Interest Group. On the occasion of the disability or absence of the Vice-Chairman, he shall perform the duties of the Vice-Chairman.

Section 7. Three members of the Advisory Committee shall be elected by the Group, one each year for a term of three years. They shall advise the officers on policies, on procedures, and on the convention program.

Section 8. Each Interest Group shall elect one member to serve as a delegate in the Legislative Assembly and one member to serve on the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards. The delegate shall represent the Group in the deliberations of the Assembly and shall report to the Group actions by the Assembly affecting the Group. The member of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards shall represent the Group in the deliberations of the Committee and shall report annually to the Group.

Section 9. Each Interest Group may set up committees to carry out the purposes of the Group. Recommendations of the Committees, approved by the Group, shall be presented as required either to the Administrative Council or to the Legislative Assembly.

Section 10. An Interest Group shall submit to the Finance Committee of the Association all requests for funds of the Association and any plan for assessing members, for cooperating with other groups in raising funds, or for approaching foundations or organizations in the name of the Speech Association of America. Any such plan shall be recommended to the Administrative Council for approval.

Section 11. All policies with reference to projects, services, questionnaires, and meetings between conventions proposed by an Interest Group shall be referred to the Executive Committee of the Legislative Assembly for approval.

Section 12. Interest Groups may establish, for the Administration of their activities, by-laws consistent with the Constitution and the By-Laws of the Association. The by-laws should be submitted to the Administrative Council and filed with the Executive Secretary.

Section 13. An advisor to Interest Groups shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees for a term of three years. He shall act in an advisory capacity to Interest Groups in matters pertaining to organization and standard operating procedures and shall serve as a liaison between and among Interest Groups. He shall report to the Executive Secretary and to the Legislative Assembly.

Article XI

Committees

Section 1. Standing committees of the Association shall be those provided for in the Constitution and any others authorized by and responsible to the Administrative Council and /or the Legislative Assembly.

Section 2. The Committee on Committees shall be composed of the present officers and editors of the Association, the immediate Past President, and three representatives elected by the Legislative Assembly. The Past President shall be chairman. The Committee shall recommend to the Administrative Council the personnel of (a) the Advisory Committees responsible in part to the Administrative Council: the Finance Committee, the Committee on Publications, the Committee on Public Relations, and the Committee on Time and Place; (b) the Project Committees authorized by the Administrative Council. The Committee shall recommend to the Legislative Assembly the personnel of the Advisory Committees responsible in part to the Assembly, of the Coordinating Committees, of the Service Committees, of the Study Committees, of the Committee on Credentials, and of the Committee on Resolutions. The Committee shall recommend to the Administrative Council and to the Legislative Assembly a nominee for Advisor to Interest Groups.

Section 3. The Consultation Committee shall be composed of the five immediate past Presidents of the Association, and the Executive Vice-President and the Executive Secretary as ex officio members. The Past President who has served longest on the Committee shall be chairman. The Committee shall consider and make recommendations on matters referred to it by the officials of the Association, by the Administrative Council, and by the Legislative Assembly. On matters of administration affecting the Association, the Committee shall make recommendations to the Administrative Council; on matters of policy, the Committee shall make recommendations to the Legislative Assembly.

Section 4. The Committee on Professional Ethics and Standards shall be composed of one member elected by each Interest Group under the chairmanship of the Executive Vice-President. The Committee shall consider problems of professional ethics and standards, shall advise the Legislative Assembly on standards to be adopted, and shall recommend to the Administrative Council administrative action to be taken.

Section 5. The Finance Committee shall be composed of three members, elected by the Administrative Council, one each year for a term of three years. The member serving for the third year shall be chairman. No member shall be eligible to serve for more than two consecutive terms. The members of the Committee shall serve as members of the Administrative Council.

The Finance Committee, acting under the authority of the Administrative Council, shall receive and consider requests for Association funds from officials, committee chairmen, and Interest Group chairmen. At the annual meeting the Committee shall present to a joint session of the Administrative Council and the Legislative Assembly a budget for the ensuing fiscal year. This budget, as approved by the Administrative Council, shall be published in the next issues of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and *The Speech Teacher*. Emergency adjustments of this budget may be made by the Finance Committee, and such adjustments shall be reported at the next following meeting of the Administrative Council.

The Committee may authorize the Executive Secretary to negotiate loans not to exceed $5,000 in any one fiscal year; with the approval of the President and the Executive Secretary, the Committee may authorize the buying, selling, or exchanging of the securities of the Association. The Committee shall provide for the annual audit of the accounts of the Association by a certified public accountant.

Section 6. The Committee on Publications shall be composed of the Editors of the Association, the Executive Vice-President, the Executive Secretary, and three members elected by the Administrative Council, one each year for a term of three years. The member serving for the third year shall be chairman. The Committee shall review from time to time the functions and policies of the official publications of the Association, shall examine projects proposed for publication, shall consider the

desirability of initiating projects involving publication by the Association, and shall make specific recommendations on management to the Administrative Council, and on policy to the Legislative Assembly.

Section 7. The Committee on Public Relations shall be composed of the Executive Vice-President, the First Vice-President, the Executive Secretary, and two members elected by the Administrative Council, one each year for a term of two years. The member serving for the second year shall be chairman. The Committee shall further the interests of the Association by developing wherever and whenever possible the most favorable relations with organizations, institutions, and the general public. The Committee shall report both to the Administrative Council and to the Legislative Assembly.

Section 8. The Committee on Time and Place shall be composed of the Executive Secretary (ex officio) and three members elected by the Administrative Council, one each year for a term of three years. The member serving for the third year shall be chairman. The Committee shall recommend to the Administrative Council the time and place for the annual meetings as many years in advance as the Council deems necessary. The Committee shall inform the Legislative Assembly of its recommendations.

Section 9. Project Committees, authorized by the Administrative Council, shall undertake special projects and shall report annually to the Administrative Council and to the Legislative Assembly. The chairmen of the Committees shall be designated by the Committee on Committees.

Section 10. Coordinating Committees, Service Committees, and Study Committees shall be authorized by the Legislative Assembly, to which they shall report annually. The Chairmen of the Committees shall be designated by the Committee on Committees. The Coordinating Committees shall promote reciprocal relations between the Speech Association of America and other associations in closely related fields. The Service Committees shall render continuing assistance to the members of the Association in connection with contests, discussion and debate programs, collection of contemporary materials, and preservation of historical records. The Study Committees shall be concerned with the investigation of problems not directly related to a specific Interest Group.

Section 11. Special committees may be appointed by the President, the Executive Vice-President, the First Vice-President, the Second Vice-President, and the Executive Secretary to assist them in the performance of their duties. These committees, if concerned with administrative matters, shall have official status as Association committees only if approved by the Administrative Council; if concerned with matters of policy, only if approved by the Legislative Assembly.

Section 12. Only official Association committees that have been duly recognized by the Administrative Council or by the Legislative Assembly may file budget requests with the Finance Committee.

Article XII

Amendments

Section 1. Amendments to this Constitution may be initiated by a majority of the Administrative Council present and voting, by the Committee on Resolutions of the Legislative Assembly, or by any twenty-five members of the Association.

Section 2. All proposed amendments shall be submitted to the Committee on Resolutions to be transmitted without recommendation to the Legislative Assembly for consideration.

Section 3. Before a proposed amendment is submitted to a vote of the membership, it shall be published in *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and in *The Speech Teacher*. To obtain publication, sponsors of the amendment shall supply properly signed copies to the Executive Secretary and to the Editors of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and *The Speech Teacher*.

Section 4. Final action on a proposed amendment previously published in the journals shall be taken by means of a printed ballot, which, to be valid, shall be returned postmarked not later than December 1. A two-thirds majority of those voting shall be required for adoption of an admendment.

BY-LAWS

Article I

Membership, Dues, and Fees

Section 1. There shall be seven classes of membership in the Association: student, regular, sustaining, institutional, emeritus, life, and memorial.

Section 2. Undergraduate students may be admitted to student membership. The dues shall be $3.50, payable in advance. Student members shall receive *The Quarterly Journal of*

Speech or *The Speech Teacher,* and shall be entitled to such additional rights, privileges, and services as the Administrative Council from time to time may authorize.

Section 3. Any person interested in promoting the purposes of the Association may be admitted to regular membership. The dues shall be $5.50 a year, payable in advance, and shall entitle the member to a subscription to *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* or to *The Speech Teacher.*

Section 4. Any person interested in promoting the interests of the Association and willing to contribute additional financial support may be admitted to sustaining membership. The dues shall be $16.00 a year, payable in advance. Sustaining members shall be entitled to such additional rights, privileges, and services as the Administrative Council from time to time may authorize.

Section 5. Any organized group of persons may be admitted to institutional membership. The dues shall be the same as for sustaining members. Institutional members shall be entitled to such rights, privileges, and services as the Administrative Council from time to time may authorize, but shall not have voting privileges.

Section 6. Any member who has been permitted to retire by his institution because of age or disability and who has held continuous membership in the Speech Association of America for twenty-five years shall be granted an Emeritus membership and shall be exempt from the payment of the annual dues and shall have throughout life all the privileges of a regular member.

If membership in the Association has not been continuous, a total of thirty years of membership is required for Emeritus membership.

The Executive Secretary, either on his own initiative or on the recommendation of a member of the Association who can supply the necessary information, shall present the name of any eligible member to the Administrative Council and to the Legislative Assembly at the convention immediately preceding the date of eligibility, or at any convention thereafter.

Upon the recommendation of a member of the Council or of the Assembly and upon the unanimous vote of both the Council and the Assembly, Emeritus membership may be granted to a retired member of the Association whose service to the profession has been unusual but who has not been a member of the Association for twenty-five years.

Section 7. Any member making a contribution to the Trust Funds of the Association of such amounts as the Administrative Council shall prescribe shall become a Regular Life Member, and shall have throughout life the privileges of a regular member. Any member making a contribution to the Trust Funds of the Association of such amounts as the Administrative Council shall prescribe shall become a Sustaining Life Member, and shall have throughout life the privileges of a sustaining member.

Section 8. Any person or group making a contribution to the Trust Funds of the Association of $1500.00 shall be the founder of a Memorial Membership. The contribution shall be maintained in perpetuity as a trust. The person or group establishing a Memorial Membership shall be entitled to designate the name by which it shall be known, shall be entitled to designate the person who shall hold this membership throughout life, and shall be entitled to provide a mode of selecting future life tenants of this membership.

Section 9. A member of the Association may become a member of one or more Interest Groups by notifying the Executive Secretary of his choices when he becomes a member of the Association and each time that he renews his membership.

Section 10. A member may be dropped from the Association for conduct contrary to the stated purposes of the Association, or tending to injure the Association in any way, or adversely affecting its reputation. The Administrative Council shall consider charges against a member only upon receipt of a written statement of the specific charges transmitted to the Council by the President. The Administrative Council shall have power to act after hearing the member against whom the charges have been filed. Any action affecting the status of a member shall require a three-fourths vote of those present and voting.

Section 11. Fees for registration at the annual meeting and for the Placement Service shall be determined by the Administrative Council.

Article II

Meetings

Section 1. Except in periods of emergency, when the Administrative Council may decide otherwise, an annual meeting of the Association shall be held at a time and place to be designated by the Council.

Section 2. Meetings of the Administrative Council and of the Legislative Assembly shall be open to all members of the Association. Each body may control the privileges of the floor as it sees fit.

Section 3. The Association shall assume no responsibility for statements of opinions expressed by participants in convention programs.

Article III

Election of Officials

Section 1. The President, First and Second Vice-Presidents, two of the six members of the Administrative Council to be chosen at large, thirty of the ninety members of the Legislative Assembly to be chosen at large, and sixteen of the forty-eight members of the Assembly representing geographical areas, shall be elected by the members of the Association who shall vote by mail ballot, returnable postmarked not later than November 1. The First Vice-President in any year shall automatically succeed to the Presidency for the following year and the Second Vice-President in any year shall automatically succeed to the First Vice-Presidency for the following year.

Section 2. Candidates for the respective offices, for membership on the Administrative Council, and for membership in the Legislative Assembly shall be nominated only (a) when they are designated by the Association Nominating Committee (hereinafter described), or (b) when they are named in a petition signed by any twenty-five members of the Association.

Section 3. The Association Nominating Committee shall consist of five members of the Association, none of whom shall be an officer of the Association or shall have been a member of the Nominating Committee for the preceding four years. At least one year in advance of the election of the officers, the Administrative Council at the annual meeting shall elect one member of the Association to serve on the Committee, and the Legislative Assembly, at the annual meeting, shall elect one member of the Association. The members of the Association shall elect by mail ballot three members.

Each member of the Association may nominate for the Association Nominating Committee one person, other than an officer of the Association or a member who has served on the Nominating Committee during the previous four years. The nomination must be delivered or postmarked not later than October 15. The twelve receiving the largest number of nominations shall be listed alphabetically upon the official ballot, which is to be mailed to the entire membership on or before November 1. In case of a tie for twelfth place, the number of listed nominees shall be increased to include the tying nominees. A returned ballot to be valid must be postmarked not later than December 1, and it must rank in order of preference (1, 2, 3, etc.) as many nominees as the voter may choose without any regard to the number to be elected. (The voter may rank all names on the ballot, or only those he may care to select.) The ballots shall be counted in accordance with the principle of the Hare System of Proportional Representation as exemplified in the election of Councilmen by the City of Cincinnati, 1951.

The Executive Secretary shall notify the three elected nominees immediately after the election, and receive in reply information from each of them as to whether he will be present at the meeting of the Association Nominating Committee to be held not later than the first day of the annual convention at the convention center. Anyone elected who is not in attendance at this designated committee meeting shall be deemed ineligible to serve upon the Association Nominating Committee, and the one or ones, present at the convention, next in order in accordance with the Proportional Representation system shall be named as members of the committee until a total of three shall be obtained.

The nomination and election of the Association Nominating Committee shall be under the supervision of the Executive Secretary, or of others designated from time to time by the Administrative Council. The Council may authorize the supervising officer or officers to adjust the dates or details for the process of the nomination and election of the Association Nominating Committee, if a change in the time of the annual convention, or other exigency, makes this adjustment necessary.

The member of the Committee elected by the Legislative Assembly shall convene the Committee and shall preside until the Committee shall elect a permanent chairman.

The Association Nominating Committee shall propose at least two members of the Association for each office in which succession is not automatic, at least four members for the two places on the Administrative Council, at least sixty members for thirty delegates-at-large in the Legislative Assembly, and at least thirty-

two members for the sixteen representatives of geographical areas in the Assembly.

Eight candidates shall be named from each of the four following geographical areas:

(1) the New England states, the Middle Atlantic states (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and West Virginia), District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces of Canada;

(2) the Central states (Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma), and Ontario, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan in Canada;

(3) the Southern states (Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas), and the Canal Zone;

(4) the Western states (Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Washington, Oregon, California), the territories of Hawaii and Alaska, the Philippine Islands, and Alberta and British Columbia in Canada.

From these respective geographical areas the regional and state associations may recommend candidates to the Association Nominating Committee, nominations to be in the hands of the Chairman of the Committee not later than the first day of the annual meeting.

The Chairman of the Committee shall check with the Executive Secretary on the status of the membership of all nominees. In cooperation with the Executive Secretary he shall determine the willingness of each nominee to serve. The report of the Committee shall be published in the second issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and of *The Speech Teacher* following the election of the Committee.

Section 4. Any twenty-five members of the Association may make additional nominations by submitting them to the Executive Secretary not later than thirty days after the publication of the report of the Association Nominating Committee. These nominations shall be published in the next issue of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and of *The Speech Teacher*.

Section 5. The Assembly Nominating Committee shall consist of five members of the Assembly in attendance at the convention, each from a different institution, and the five representing the four geographical areas. A person who has served on the Assembly Nominating Committee during the previous two years shall be ineligible to serve on the Committee. The Assembly Nominating Committee shall be elected by preferential ballot. At the first meeting of the Assembly at the convention preceding the one in which the Committee positions to be filled fall vacant, the Nominating Committee shall nominate candidates for Committee posts which the Assembly is authorized to fill by election. Each member of the Assembly shall be entitled to cast a ballot on which he lists the names of five eligible candidates for the Nominating Committee. The one member of the Association Nominating Committee to be elected by the Legislative Assembly shall be elected by preferential ballot in the Assembly. The member elected shall be ineligible to serve on the Assembly Nominating Committee.

Section 6. The Executive Vice-President, the Executive Secretary, the Editor of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, the Editor of *The Speech Teacher*, the Editor of *Speech Monographs*, and a Finance Committee of three members shall be elected by the Administrative Council for terms of three years.

Section 7. The President and the Editors of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *The Speech Teacher*, and *Speech Monographs* shall be ineligible to succeed themselves.

Section 8. The Executive Vice-President, the Executive Secretary, and the Editors of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *The Speech Teacher*, and *Speech Monographs* shall be elected at least one year in advance of their respective terms of office.

Section 9. All officers shall begin their terms January 1 except the Executive Secretary who shall assume his duties at the beginning of the fiscal year, July 1.

Section 10. When vacancies occur in the offices of the Association or in the list of nominees presented by the Nominating Committee, the Administrative Council shall designate replacements, unless otherwise provided for by the Constitution.

Section 11. If an editor of any one of the official publications of the Association should die or become disabled before he has completed two years of service, a new editor shall be elected to complete the original three-year term. If an editor should die or become disabled after he has served two years or longer, then the editor-elect shall be asked to assume the editorship for the balance of the deceased or the disabled editor's term as well as for his own three-year term.

Article IV

Delegates to the Legislative Assembly

Section 1. The names of the delegates chosen by each regional and national organization to be represented in the Legislative Assembly shall be forwarded to the Executive Secretary of the Speech Association of America one month prior to the annual meeting.

Section 2. Members holding office in the Association or in Interest Groups shall be ineligible for nomination as candidates for delegates-at-large to the Legislative Assembly.

Section 3. No member of the Assembly shall be entitled to cast more than a single vote, even though he may be chosen to represent more than one organization. The representation of an organization other than the one he chooses to represent may be assumed by an alternate.

Section 4. No delegate elected for a three-year term shall be eligible to succeed himself.

Section 5. A delegate to the Assembly elected from a geographical area shall complete his term in the Assembly even though he changes his geographical area of residence before the expiration of his term.

Article V

Organization and Meetings of Interest Groups

Section 1. The organization of a new Interest Group may be initiated by a sponsoring committee of three members of the Association. After formulating a statement of intention to organize and after obtaining the signatures of at least twelve other members of the Association, the sponsoring committee shall send a copy of the prepared statement with the list of signatures to (a) the First Vice-President in order that he may assign a place and a time prior to the convention program for forming a temporary organization, (b) the Editors of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and *The Speech Teacher* in order that they may publish the prepared statement with the list of signatures in the October and November issues respectively, and (c) the Executive Secretary in order that he may have an official record of the proposed Interest Group.

Section 2. At the initial meeting requested by the sponsoring committee of the proposed Interest Group and scheduled by the First Vice-President, the Group shall form a temporary organization in accordance with parliamentary procedure and shall elect a temporary chairman and a temporary secretary. The Group shall adopt a resolution setting forth (a) the name and scope of the Group, (b) the purposes, (c) the differentiation of the Group from existing Interest Groups, and (d) the relation of the Group to the field of speech. The temporary officers shall obtain the signatures of one hundred members of the Association in support of the resolution.

Section 3. The temporary chairman of the Group shall submit to the Executive Secretary the resolution with the signatures of one hundred members of the Association and the names of the temporary officers for presentation to the Administrative Council.

Section 4. Upon receiving notice of a favorable action from the Administrative Council, the Group shall organize a permanent Interest Group with the election of a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman, a Secretary, three members to serve as an Advisory Committee (one for one year, one for two years, and one for three years), and a delegate to serve in the Legislative Assembly in accordance with the provisions set forth in Sections 4 through 8 of Article X of the Constitution.

Section 5. At each annual meeting five members of the Interest Group shall be elected to serve as the Nominating Committee of the Interest Group for the following year. No more than one member of the Committee shall be chosen from any state or territory. No member shall be eligible to succeed himself. The Committee shall nominate two candidates for Vice-Chairman, two candidates for Secretary, two candidates for the new members of the Advisory Committee, two candidates for the delegate to the Legislative Assembly, and two candidates for the representative on the Committee on Ethics and Standards. The Secretary of the Interest Group shall report the results of the election to the Executive Secretary of the Association.

Section 6. The Interest Groups shall meet at the time and place of the annual meeting of the Association as designated by the Administrative Council. Business of the Interest Groups shall be transacted immediately before or after the main programs of the Groups or at such other time as the Administrative Council shall designate.

Section 7. The tentative program of an Interest Group shall be cleared with the First Vice-President of the Association at a date set by him. If the Vice-Chairman of an Interest Group does not fulfill his obligation by the time designated by the First Vice-President, the latter shall have the power to designate another

member of the Group to complete the program.

Section 8. When a national organization representing interests of one or more Interest Groups meets at the same time and place with the Speech Association of America, the Vice-Chairmen of the Interest Groups concerned shall plan the convention program in close cooperation with the program chairman of that national organization.

Article VI

Procedure for Voting and Reporting the Vote

Section 1. Voting on candidates for offices in the Association, on members for the Administrative Council, on delegates for the Legislative Assembly, on members for the Nominating Committee, and on amendments to the Constitution shall be on official ballots supplied by the Executive Secretary. The ballots shall be returned to the Executive Secretary and, to be valid, shall be postmarked not later than December 1.

The ballots for candidates for offices in the Association, for members of the Administrative Council, and for delegates to the Legislative Assembly, to be valid, shall be returned to the Executive Secretary, postmarked not later than November 1. The ballots for members of the Nominating Committee and for amendments to the Constitution, to be valid, shall be returned to the Executive Secretary postmarked not later than December 1.

Section 2. The Executive Secretary shall seek the assistance of two members of the Association in checking the tallies on all ballots before he announces the results. The verified report shall be made available to all members in attendance at the annual meeting and shall be published in the next issues of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* and *The Speach Teacher*.

Section 3. If a change in the time of the annual meeting, or other exigency, makes adjustment necessary, the Administrative Council may authorize a change in the time for balloting.

Article VII

Parliamentary Authority

In the absence of any provision to the contrary in the Constitution and in the By-Laws, all business meetings of the Association, of the Administrative Council, of the Legislative Assembly, and of the Interest Groups shall be governed by the parliamentary rules and usages contained in the current edition of Robert's *Rules of Order, Revised*.

Article VIII

Quorum

Section 1. A quorum at any meeting of the Administrative Council shall be nine members, of whom a majority shall be present or past officers or editors of the Association.

Section 2. A quorum at any meeting of the Legislative Assembly shall be fifty members, of whom a majority shall be delegates selected by the ballots of the membership.

Section 3. Each Interest Group shall determine the number required for a quorum to transact its business.

Article IX

Amendments

Section 1. Amendments to these By-Laws may be initiated by a majority of the Administrative Council present and voting, by the Committee on Resolutions of the Legislative Assembly, or by any fifteen members of the Association.

Section 2. For the adoption of a proposed amendment, a majority vote of both the Administrative Council and the Legislative Assembly shall be required.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

All terms begin January 1, 1960

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

Waldo W. Braden, Louisiana State University

MEMBERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Marie K. Hochmuth, University of Illinois
Ernest J. Wrage, Northwestern University

REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES TO THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Central Area

Charles Balcer, St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota
Samuel L. Becker, State University of Iowa
Keith Brooks, Ohio State University
Dorothy Weirich, Webster Groves High School, Webster Groves, Missouri

Eastern Area

Carroll C. Arnold, Cornell University
Geraldine Garrison, Consultant, Speech & Hearing Services, Connecticut State Department of Education, Hartford
Harold M. Scholl, State Teachers College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey

Hollis White, Queens College, Flushing, New York

Southern Area

Frank B. Davis. Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn
Robert C. Jeffrey, University of Virginia
Eugene E. White, University of Miami, Coral Gables
Donald M. Williams, University of Texas

Western Area

Elizabeth B. Carr, University of Hawaii
Milton Dobkin, Humboldt State College, Arcata, California
Fred McMahon, San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, California
Orville Pence, University of Washington

REPRESENTATIVES-AT-LARGE IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Elton Abernathy, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos
Merrill Baker, University of South Dakota
Gladys L. Borchers, University of Wisconsin
George Bohman, Wayne State University, Detroit
Winston L. Brembeck, University of Wisconsin
Paul A. Carmack, Ohio State University
Betty May Collins, Technical High School, Memphis, Tennessee
Raymond L. DeBoer, Colorado State College, Greeley
Helen M. Donovan, New York City Public Schools
Wayne C. Eubank, University of New Mexico
H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Purdue University
Mary Louise Gehring, Stetson University, Deland, Florida
Robert G. Gunderson, Indiana University
Don Geiger, University of California, Berkeley
Donald A. Harrington, University of Florida, Gainesville
James H. Henning, University of West Virginia, Morgantown
Wilbur Samuel Howell, Princeton University
William S. Howell, University of Minnesota
Ray Irwin, Syracuse University
Ruth Beckey Irwin, Ohio State University
T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama
James McBurney, Northwestern University
William McCoard, University of Southern California
N. Edd Miller, University of Michigan
Glenn E. Mills, Northwestern University
Thomas Nilsen, University of Washington
Robert P. Oliver, Pennsylvania State University
Carrie Rasmussen, Madison Public Schools, Wisconsin
Ronald F. Reid, Washington University, St. Louis
Robert Clyde Yarbrough, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth

RESULTS OF VOTE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

All twenty constitutional amendments were passed by the required two-thirds majority. The results were:

Amendment	For	Against
1	919	24
2	924	21
3	892	43
4	880	54
5	919	10
6	898	18
7	879	32
8	875	43
9	858	49
10	876	37
11	860	62
12	778	110
13	868	38
14	892	11
15	843	47
16	779	56
17	733	54
18	738	170
19	734	174
20	742	163

QUESTIONS ON QUESTIONS

To the Editor:

Time and again my students have groaned, I have grumbled, and other forensics directors have muttered imprecations about the current debate topic, whatever the year or the topic. Articles have appeared in the speech journals which point out that the affirmative team hasn't a chance, either because of the lopsidedness of the judges or of the question. If the reactions of debaters and debate coaches are worth noting, we might conclude that our national debate questions frequently leave something to be desired. Is there any way to improve them?

Perhaps we should admit at the outset that sometimes our debate questions

are not quite realistic in that we force students to take positions which are absolute and extreme, whereas in Congress the sharpest debate comes not on a yes-no issue, but on the question of degree. For example, on the question of discontinuing direct economic aid to foreign countries, we asked students to debate a black and white issue, while in the Congress the issue is how much aid or how little, and of what kind, and to whom, not a question of stopping it all together. Some debate questions in the past few years have resembled closely the debates in the nation or the world, as when we debated the recognition of Red China or the right-to-work laws. Perhaps we cannot always choose a question which divides neatly into opposing sides, but we might try for it.

What we need, I think, is not a bigger and better committee to tabulate our responses and do the final wording of the question, but a different approach to the method of selecting the debate question. It occurs to me that our present system expresses an unjustified faith in the wisdom of a numerical majority of all speech teachers present.

We can probably agree that we speech teachers are well educated; we may even feel that we are more broadly educated than some of our colleagues in education. But if we claim to be experts on nuclear warfare, foreign aid, labor relations, and similar complicated problems, our fellow faculty members may well ask how we have time to be expert in speech. To be sure, at the end of a year of directing research and judging debates on a particular topic, we may have acquired some expertness; but, by then, it is time to select the next topic. Our lack of thorough understanding of political and economic problems may explain why some of the topics we submit for debate resolutions turn out to be not very debatable come October and November. Even the best of wording committees cannot tabulate a thousand ambiguous and inadequate suggestions into one valid debate resolution.

At the Chicago convention at Christmas, a professor of history said he thought our current debate topic was a poor one because the information on which the ultimate decision would be based was secret and not available to the debaters whom we are asking to resolve the problem. Granted this is one man's opinion, but personally I might have voted for a different topic if that thought had occurred to me in April, instead of December. Rather than waiting until December to call in experts from other fields to tell us about the ins and outs of a question, why not call in the experts in the spring and let them suggest some topics? From their more complete understanding of special areas they should be able to suggest topics which would be truly debatable. We would still vote on their suggestions, and we could still reserve the right to add new questions. The questions suggested by the experts could be published in the speech journals in time for us to consider them before we cast our first ballot.

It is probably safe to say that even the aid of the experts would not guarantee a perfect debate question delighted in by all students and teachers. But at least we would be putting into effect one of the principles we teach our students; i.e., make use of the best available sources of information. That could mean calling in the experts.

WALTER F. STROMER
Cornell College

A FOOTNOTE ON HAWAIIAN ORTHOGRAPHY

To the Editor:

The latest book on Hawaiian which has come to my attention is a dictionary by Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert, both of whom are certainly experts and specialists.[1] On page vii of the Preface, the authors write of the early inconsistent spellings of Hawaiian words. "In 1829," they continue, "the missionaries decided to end this spelling diversity, and they adopted by vote an alphabet with vowels corresponding to the so-called continental sound values and with the usual English values of the consonants. C. M. Wise and Wesley Hervey[2] have described the dramatic tale of the fashioning of this alphabet."

Wise and Hervey describe (pp. 313ff.) the efforts of the Boston missionaries to fashion a written form of Hawaiian. At first, they imitated and invented. Then, the authors relate "a sudden and radical change for the better." Two copies of a "New Zealand Grammar and Vocabulary" were received which confirmed the missionaries in their choice of five vowel letters and twelve consonant letters to express the sounds of the language. Six days after the arrival of this book, on January 7, 1822, the first printing ever done in Hawaiian came off the missionary press. Wise and Hervey tell of the arrival three months later of William Ellis, a missionary from the Society Islands, who helped influence the final choice of the letters of the alphabet. He had read, as the authors point out, John Pickering's work on a uniform orthography for North American Indian languages.[3] This is all quite true and represents a pretty piece of linguistic detective work, drawing, as Wise and Hervey did, from old journals, newspapers, and narratives. However, there is an omission. And since the omission has been made by experts and specialists the omission will probably continue to be made—complete with footnotes and authorities.

It is nice to think of the Boston missionaries and Mr. Ellis arriving at a phonemic alphabet—pulling it, as it were, from a proper Bostonian silk hat —without one of them, except Mr. Ellis, who arrived when the project was already well conceived, having had any linguistic training. Such, however, was not the case. The missionaries were smarter than that. . . .

In my doctoral dissertation,[4] written under Professor Wise's direction, after the publication of the article by him and Hervey, I used as one of my sources a book by John Pickering's daughter.[5] In this book are many letters written by John Pickering. On October 19, 1819, he wrote (pp. 291-292) to Hiram Bingham, who was to be the leader of the Boston missionaries:

> As various nations of Europe are engaged in the work of foreign missions, and have already written and will continue to write and publish books, both for the instruction of the heathen and for the information of the learned, it is desirable that some common orthography should be adopted for the unwritten languages. . . . For this reason I have long thought it would be best to adopt as the basis of the orthography what we call the foreign sounds of the vowels. . . . I hope your duties will per-

[1] *Hawaiian-English Dictionary* (Honolulu, 1957).

[2] "The Evolution of Hawaiian Orthography," *QJS*, XXXVIII (1952), 311-325.

[3] John Pickering, "An Essay on a Uniform Orthography for the Indian Languages on North America," *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* (Cambridge, 1820).

[4] Cj Stevens, *Early American Phonology* (Unpublished dissertation, Louisiana State University, August 1954).

[5] Mary Orne Pickering, *Life of John Pickering* (Girard, Kansas, 1920), p. 5.

mit you occasionally to compare the languages of your islanders with those of the others in the South Sea, and also with those of the Asiatic and American coasts,—an inquiry which may ultimately be of great utility.[6]

Mary Orne Pickering writes (p. 291):

In the year 1819, when the Reverend Hiram Bingham was about setting off as the first missionary sent to the Sandwich Islands by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, he came to consult my father as to the mode of writing the unwritten dialects of those islands, and he brought with him a Hawaiian (Owhyheean) youth, Thomas Hopoo, educated at the Foreign Missionary School at Cornwall, Connecticut, with whom an idea of the sounds of his native language could be obtained. By Mr. Bingham's earnest and anxious desire, my father gave him his views advocating the adoption of the foreign sounds of the vowels, afterwards forming the basis of his Essay on the Uniform Orthography of Indian Languages, which was published in the Memoires [*sic*] of the American Academy.[7]

In a letter to Baron Humbolt, dated January 14, 1828, John Pickering writes (pp. 356-357):

You will see . . . that our missionaries have adopted the systematic orthography which I recommended for our American languages.[7]

So the Boston missionaries, anticipating the orthographic problems ahead of them, went to Pickering for advice and took it. Undoubtedly Ellis, with his superior linguistic experience, helped them simplify and fit the orthography; but the bases for the Hawaiian alphabet came direct from Boston with the foresighted Mr. Bingham.

Doubtless, the *Hawaiian-English Dictionary* will not be withdrawn from circulation whilst Pukui and Elbert correct the sentence to read: "—and with additional light shed on this factor by Cj Stevens." Sometimes, however, some expert and specialist may, after careful checking of original sources, add this footnote on Hawaiian orthography.

CJ STEVENS
The University of Kansas City

[6] Quoted in full in *Early American Phonology*, p. 162.
[7] Both letters quoted, *Ibid*, p. 185.

NOTICE

A new Editor and Editorial Board take office on January 1, 1960, and become responsible for the *Journal* with the issue of February 1960. The names of the members of the new Editorial Board will be announced in The Forum for December. In the meantime, *and effective at once*, persons wishing to submit manuscripts should send them to Professor Richard Murphy, Editor-Elect, *QJS*, 204A Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

DONALD C. BRYANT
Editor

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, *Editor*

CURRENT THEORY AND RESEARCH IN MOTIVATION

Andrew Thomas Weaver

No one who practices or teaches the principles and techniques of speech should remain uninformed regarding the materials made available in the six Nebraska Symposia on Motivation edited by Professor Marshall R. Jones and in Professor Dalbir Bindra's *Motivation, A Systematic Reinterpretation.*

Beginning with 1953, Symposia on Motivation have been held annually at the University of Nebraska under the auspices of the Department of Psychology, with the assistance of a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. Each of the volumes contains not only papers by leading psychologists, but also comments and discussions, and extensive working bibliographies. If these bibliographies could be combined and indexed, they would constitute a very valuable contribution to the literature of the field. The introductions by the editor are excellent general critiques of the papers and comments.

Before venturing upon any over-all appraisal of the six volumes of the Symposia, it seems desirable to mention a few high spots in the published collections of papers and comments.

Mr. Weaver (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1923; LL.D., Carroll, 1946) is Professor of Speech at the University of Wisconsin, Past-President of the Speech Association of America, and a former Editor of QJS.

Volume I.

In the foreword to this first volume Editor Jones says:

> The problems of motivation are significant for and relevant to practically every phase of contemporary psychology. Motivation provides a central theme around which a vast amount of experimental data from many divergent sources can be assembled and evaluated.

In "Problems Presented by the Concept of Acquired Drives," Professor Judson S. Brown remarks:

> It is perhaps safe to say that in every serious attempt to account for the behavior of living organisms, the concept of motivation, in one guise or another, has played a major explanatory role.

Professor Theodore M. Newcomb's "Motivation in Social Behavior" holds special interest for the social psychologist and the student of speech. The author seems to penetrate close to the very heart of the problem when he says:

> An adequate general theory would take fuller account than it does today of self-orientations —a theory of motivation without self-orientations would be, if not Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark, at least Hamlet without Ophelia.

One could wish that this directive had been more influential in determining the emphasis in some of the subsequent programs.

Volume II.

As one reads the papers in this second volume one seems to sense a growing awareness of the need for, and the difficulty of satisfactory definitions. This problem which persists throughout the Symposia seems to defy solution.

In Professor John W. Atkinson's "Exploration Using Imaginative Thought to Assess the Strength of Human Motives," we are told that

> free-associative, unguarded thought provides the richest source of evidence concerning human motives.

This approach rises above some of the non-verbal techniques of experimentation with non-symbolizing animal species and seems to come closer to the sort of analysis in which students of speech can find light.

Volume III.

The discussions in this volume recall the story of the economics professor whose former student, in looking over an examination, observed that the questions were the same as those which had been asked a good many years previously. Said the professor, "The questions are the same, but the answers now are different." The reader feels that the same problems in the field of motivation have been with us for a long time but that there are many interesting new approaches to them.

Editor Jones comments that Harry S. Harlow's monkeys, Henry W. Nissen's chimpanzees, and the college student subjects of Leon Festinger and George Klein seem to be treated as different from Brown's and Farber's rats! This observation is echoed by Professor Paul T. Young in "The Role of Hedonic Processes in Motivation," when he says:

> Urbana rats and Michigan sophomores undoubtedly differ in many respects, including their value systems.

In "Some Social Consequences of Achievement Motivation" Professor David C. McClelland stresses the importance of the question, "What motives do men have that rats do not?" He comments:

> The study of human motives—in the sense of accurately measuring them with due attention to their differences in kind and their social consequences—is just beginning.

This recognition that there are essential differences among lower animals and between them and human beings does not seem always to be kept in sharp focus by participants in these Symposia.

Anyone interested in studies of attitude or attitude changes certainly should read and ponder well Helen Peak's "Attitude and Motivation." It is rich in interesting observations as to the basis of human motivation, and in implications for the worker in persuasion. Especially seminal is her emphasis upon "the self-concept" as a theory of how motivations evolve. She makes a convincing case for the close interdependence of attitudes and motives.

Volume IV.

After one has read Volume IV, he is more than ready to accept the sobering judgment of Professor Sigmund Koch, in "Behavior as 'Intrinsically' Regulated . . . ," when he says:

> Psychology is not ready for high-order theory of any great range or predictive power. We lack basic areas of empirical knowledge of the sort necessary for adequate theory. . . . We are *not* in a 'Galilean era' of theoretical construction; we are closer to Thales than to Galileo. We are a science still groping for the identification of our own basic variables.

Professor Koch seems to be poised on the threshold of a dynamic breakthrough in motivational theory when he writes:

> The facts pointing to 'intrinsic determination' are available to all of us. Any line of criticism

that discounts these facts and the pre-theoretical requirements which they define because of the circumstance that theoretical *requirements* are not theory or that these requirements are not immediately or easily translated into a sure-fire experimental program—is merely to substitute defensive complacency for scientific curiosity and courage.

Dr. Koch properly indicates deep concern over the tendency of a good many psychologists to assume that the results of animal experimentation can be applied in a blanket fashion to "man in his most characteristically human performances," which involve "intrinsic determination."

Volume V.

Editor Jones gives us an initial jolt with his statement in the preface:

> It is increasingly apparent that this [motivation] is a vast 'country' only a little explored.

And Professor Donald B. Lindsley in "Psychophysiology and Motivation" writes:

> A visitor from outer space . . . would no doubt be amazed by many things upon this earth . . . but when he came to the topic of motivation, I have a feeling he really would be in a quandary.

Surprisingly, Lindsley is driven back to Webster's Dictionary for his definition of "motivation," and after quoting it he continues:

> We often treat motivation as if it were a construct, some hypothetical something, which can be added to or subtracted from, like so much gasoline in the tank of an automobile. . . . By the time we make a few more assumptions or inferences about secondary goals and reinforcements, we are "out of gas" on an uncharted road—stranded. That seems to be about what has happened to us in recent years with our theorizing about motivation.

Pauline Snedden Sears, in her lengthy paper, "Problems in the Investigation of Achievement and Self-Esteem Motivation," offers many interesting suggestions for students of persuasion, particularly with reference to the behavior of children.

Professor Charles E. Osgood, in "Motivational Dynamics of Language Behavior," deals in a deeply insightful way with *perceptual organization, motor skills,* and *symbolic processes.* He sees in the phenomena of language behavior the key to much of what is generally regarded as motivation. His paper is not easy reading, but it repays painstaking study.

Volume VI.

In the introduction, Professor Jones maintains that "drive" is a concept useful only temporarily until we can discover more fundamental variables. He underwrites Robert C. Bolles' warning, in "The Usefulness of the Drive Concept," that we talk about "drives" only because we know so little about more specific types of behavior and their control.

Richard A. Littman in his "Motives, History and Causes," seriously questions the possibility of ever developing a unified theory of motivation. He says:

> I will argue that in terms of the kinds of things that the contemporary scientist is interested in there is only a trivial communality among these motivational terms.

He goes on to maintain that there are no general answers to such questions as, "Where do motives come from?" "How do they operate?" "How can they be manipulated and aroused?" etc.

One of the gems of the entire collection of papers is Littman's definition of motivation:

> I would now like to offer a 'definition' of motivation that is sufficiently comprehensive to incorporate all previously listed motivational phenomena and all phenomena of that sort which might be discovered in the future. Motivation refers to processes or conditions which may be physiological or psychological, innate or

acquired, internal or external to the organism which determine or describe how, or in respect of what, behavior is initiated, maintained, guided, selected, or terminated; it also refers to end states which such behavior frequently achieves or is designed to achieve whether they are conditions of the organism or environment; it also refers to the behavior engaged in, or aspects of that behavior, in respect of its organization, or termination with regard to past or present or future organic or environmental conditions; further it refers to the fact that an individual will learn or remember or forget certain material, as well as the rate or manner in which these processes occur and the ease or difficulty with which they are altered, as well as to some of the processes or conditions that are responsible for this behavior; similarly it determines how and what perceptual and judgmental activities and outcomes will occur, as well as some of the conditions and determinants of such activities and outcomes; similarly, it also refers to the fact of and the determinants of the occurrence and fate of affective process; finally, it describes and accounts for various individual differences which appear in respect of the various behavior, processes, conditions, and outcomes referred to above.

This semi-serious semantic nightmare reduces the problem of definition to an absurdity.

Littman's discussion of "actives" and "passives" is enlightening; it sets forth the view that only gestalt psychology has developed concepts as "actives." Littman concludes that we have little hope of ever developing "a master schema that will encompass all motivational phenomena." Thus the final symposium closes on a pessimistic note.

Professor Bindra in the second item under review, shows a comprehensive familiarity with all that has been done in the field of motivation. His citations, footnotes, and bibliography indicate a sure-footed acquaintance with the vast literature of the field. He includes references to the research and writings of twenty-two of the thirty-six contributors to the Nebraska Symposia. The preface contains the following:

This book attempts to provide a systematic presentation of the variety of experimental findings emerging from recent research in the area of psychology labeled motivation. I have aimed at writing it in such a way that the undergraduate, given occasional guidance, will not find it too difficult and the graduate student and research worker will not find it too elementary.

It would seem that Bindra has done a remarkably skillful job of this delicate navigating between Scylla and Charybdis.

Professor Bindra stresses the growing dissatisfaction with the idea that the entire range of behavior phenomena can be reduced to a few "drives." He says:

Implied in the concept of drive is the notion that the organism would not be active at all were it not for the operation of one drive or another. This implication is misleading and contrary to the fact.

Here his position is reminiscent of John Dewey's, viz, that the normal state of animal existence is activity. As Dewey says:

In every fundamental sense it is false that a man requires a motive to make him do something. . . . He is an active being and that's all there is to be said on that score.

Says Bindra:

The main feature of the point of view adopted in this book is that it is unnecessary and futile to postulate drives, motives, instincts, or any other end-determining systems in order to account for the various motivational phenomena.

Speaking of instincts, drives, needs, and motives he draws attention to the fact that

these terms apply to hypothetical constructs that directly correspond to the observed activities they are designed to explain.

And so we are brought full circle back to our starting point.

In his final chapter Bindra sets down sixteen "tentative conclusions," a reading of which leaves us with a rather dis-

couraging outlook regarding the present and the future of motivational research. One key remark which epitomizes a basic difficulty is:

> In man, the use of language immensely increases the number of responses that become associated with the different classes of goals. . . . The regular use of language symbols as reinforcers tremendously increases the number of goals and individual differences in the relevance of different goals required for an adequate description of behavior.

Where does all this leave us? Without intending to depreciate anyone's serious work, one cannot but be reminded of the old philosophical quandary: looking for a black cat in a dark cellar when there is no cat there! We feel somewhat like the fifth grade pupil who was asked to review a book drawn by lot from the school library, *The Life and Habits of The Penguin*. His review consisted of a single sentence: "This book tells me more about penguins than I care to know about penguins." I think it may be said with some justification that for the average reader at least, these seven books tell him more about motivation than he can understand and apply.

We must be wary of two ever-present perils in evolving working theories of motivation: (1) we should not forget that there probably *is* considerable difference between the Michigan sophomore and the Illinois rat; and (2) we must not yield too blindly to the theory that we live and move and have our being wholly in a physically deterministic universe. As Harold Blake Walker recently wrote in a little essay entitled, "Man is More Than Merely an Animal":

> Man is an animal of course. . . . He has instincts and appetites that make him a member of the animal kingdom, but he also has capacities that make him unique among the animals.

And, as Leslie John Adkins, writing in the *Christian Century*, January 14, 1959, under the title "The Creative Factor in Man," asserts:

> That man's behavior is determined we all admit. But we differ in what determines it. Some thinkers ascribe exclusive power to force in the external world and compulsion within man. Others contend that *the independent action of a creative self also helps to determine behavior* [Italics, ours]. . . . The man in the street stubbornly asserts that he directs himself; he rejects any theory of human behavior which tells him that he has only the illusion of choice. . . . The psychologist is not magician enough to pull the rabbit of free choice out of the psycho-biological system which represents the scientist's currently fashionable image of man. . . . In understanding the physical world determinism is adequate and therefore validly scientific. But in understanding man determinism is not adequate, for it distorts by over simplifying the pattern. The added hypothesis of the independent factor allows us to see man as comprising both a deterministic personality system and a creative element. Interaction between the two helps us to understand the whole man.

Lest it be objected that, in this final note, we have abandoned the scientific and gone animistic, it may be well to recall some words from Wendell Johnson's *Your Most Enchanted Listener:*

> He [man] can create and use symbols so elaborately and with such effects as to make it impractical and misleading to classify man as an animal at all for many purposes. As human beings we are a symbolizing class of life, and unless one wants to split hairs we are the only such class.

It is this capacity for symbolization which incredibly complicates human motivation and renders its analysis so baffling. It probably will be a long, long time before a comprehensive categorizing of human motives can be accomplished. When we contemplate the 600,000 words in the dictionary and the 10,000,000,000 cells in the human body —leaving completely out of considera-

tion the myriad environmental energies which impinge upon the human nervous system—we are struck with wonder that we can make any predictions at all about cause and effect in the behavior of *homo sapiens.* Nevertheless, without beginnings however humble, there can be no science at all.

BOOKS REVIEWED

CURRENT THEORY AND RESEARCH IN MOTIVATION, A SYMPOSIUM (Volume I). Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1953; pp. 194. Paper $2.00.

NEBRASKA SYMPOSIUM ON MOTIVATION (Volume II). Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1954; pp. 322. Paper $3.00.

NEBRASKA SYMPOSIUM ON MOTIVATION (Volume III). Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1955; pp. 274. Paper $3.00. (Reviewed by William S. Howell, *QJS,* XLII [April, 1956], pp. 205-206.)

NEBRASKA SYMPOSIUM ON MOTIVATION (Volume IV). Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1956; pp. 311. Paper $3.00.

NEBRASKA SYMPOSIUM ON MOTIVATION (Volume V). Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1957; pp. 430. Paper $3.00.

NEBRASKA SYMPOSIUM ON MOTIVATION (Volume VI). Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1958; pp. 278. Paper $3.00.

MOTIVATION, A SYSTEMATIC REINTERPRETATION. By Dalbir Bindra. New York: Ronald Press, 1959; pp. viii+361. $5.50.

ARISTOTLE'S POETICS: THE ARGUMENT. By Gerald F. Else. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957; pp. xvi+670. $11.00.

Proceeding from the premise that "the *Poetics* is a single, coherent piece of argument," Professor Else has developed a detailed and scrupulously careful account of Aristotle's meaning in that perennially vexed book. Else translates and examines minutely all but three and a half non-integral chapters of the *Poetics,* illuminating, sometimes through radical reinterpretation, such subjects as the concept of "imitation," the doctrines of "time-unity," and of catharsis, and the relationships among *pathos,* recognition, peripety, *harmatia,* and catharsis. By exposing the internal logical machinery of the *Poetics* as a whole, Else reveals the disservice frequently done Aristotle by commentators who have taken as distinctly independent observations what are actually fragments of a synoptic view of tragedy and epic.

General observations on the accomplishments and limitations of Aristotle's literary theory punctuate the detailed analysis. Frequently, these observations both elucidate difficult sections of the text and also account for their difficulty. For example, Else's emphasis on the uniqueness of Aristotle's distinction between poetry and music, a distinction established "for the first time in classical Greece," illuminates Chapter I of the *Poetics* and, in addition, suggests the formidable problems of exposition which Aristotle confronted in driving distinctions across the grain of his own language. A sensitivity to Aristotle's achievements in the context of his own time pervades Else's study. But, the exegete's respect for his text does not distract him from its deficiencies, as, at the conclusion of a comparison of some Greek dramas with Aristotle's prescription for plot, Else remarks, "Tragedy in its greatest days comported things that were not dreamt of in Aristotle's philosophy."

Probably no reader of this work will find every page of it equally convincing. This reviewer, for example, was unconvinced by Else's adventurous interpretation of the troublesome "one revolution of the sun" passage in Chapter V. However, it is a tribute to Else's work that his own consistently high standards of validity in textual interpretation indirectly recommend occasional skepticism.

Rhetoricians will be especially interested in the view, promulgated in this study, that Aristotle was much more attentive to the influence of dramaturgic technique on audiences than is ordinarily believed. One is brought to a richer understanding of the *Rhetoric,* as well as of the *Poetics,* by such clarifications of methodology.

Much of Else's lengthy analysis is necessarily concerned with highly refined philological questions, so that parts of it are tortuous for the non-classicist. Its rewards, however, justify the labor. Else has penetrated the ponderous movement and textural density of Aristotle's style to disclose the clean precision of his methodology and, at an even deeper level, the

mind behind the work. While a revelation of Aristotle's intellection is not the announced intention of this exegesis, it is a measure of the success of the exegesis that the revelation is there.

EDWIN BLACK
Washington University

THE KING'S WAR, 1641-1647. By C. V. Wedgwood. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. 703. $7.50.

The publication of *The King's War*, the second volume of a projected trilogy based on the English Civil War, is indeed a memorable event, for it marks the emergence of Wedgwood as a name now as prominent in historiography as it has long been in pottery. Should Bruce Catton have turned his attention to the English rather than the American Civil War, he probably would have written his narrative in much the same manner as Miss Wedgwood has.

Two hundred pages longer than its predecessor, *The King's War* demonstrates anew the author's ability to weave diverse facts into a fascinating historical pattern—a pattern whose focal point is the struggles of the precedent-setting Long Parliament of 1640. Here emerge the hidden and overt persuaders of England in the seventeenth century: John Pym, the shrewd and steady pilot of the House of Commons, whose untimely death almost ended the parliamentary cause; Edward Hyde, the tactful Royalist pamphleteer whose astute analysis of his audience made Puritans curse; young Sir Harry Vane, a brilliant ambassador cast in the Machiavellian mold; and of course Oliver Cromwell, the quiet Independent who became the most feared of the parliamentary commanders. With dramatic effectiveness, Miss Wedgwood succeeds in her goal of bringing out "the hourly urgency and confusion through which contemporaries lived."

Like the late Benjamin Thomas, C. V. Wedgwood is an adherent of that school of historians and biographers who recognize the importance of imagination in the portrayal of character. Thus, for example, no evidence has yet been unearthed (or ever may be) that John Pym controlled the mobs of London apprentices whose noisy appearance coincided so well with the measures he wished to have a reluctant Parliament adopt. Yet there is no doubt in Miss Wedgwood's mind on this matter; to have omitted this facet of Pym's behavior would, in her opinion, have been to leave the story incomplete.

More accurate than Gardiner, more detailed than Trevelyan, more gripping than most Stuart history and biography, the Wedgwood trilogy will in time become the most widely read and enjoyed work on this period. This is a promise, not a prediction.

GOODWIN F. BERQUIST, JR.
Ohio State University

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, DEFENDER OF THE UNION. By Gerald M. Capers. Boston: Little, Brown, 1959; pp. xii+239. $3.50.

An opponent of a martyr or a myth sometimes has difficulty getting his just dues even from historians. This has been the fate of Stephen A. Douglas, who for a long time was cast in the shadow of Abraham Lincoln. He has been represented as a scheming, conniving politician who opposed the Great Emancipator and who attempted to thwart the abolition of slavery.

However, recent biographers who have taken a long look at the Little Giant find much in his career to respect and to admire. Such is the biographer discussed in this review. Gerald M. Capers, head of the Department of History at Newcomb College, Tulane University, has sought to re-evaluate the career of this controversial figure, "not on the bases of hindsight—but in the light of the standards and events of his own times as they unfold, that is, in his own milieu." What are Capers' conclusions? He argues that Douglas was no worse or no better than his contemporaries in the rough-and-tumble of the turbulent times in which he struggled. At one place Capers observes: "Lincoln and Douglas were politicians, the one as much as the other. If the worse interpretation be placed on the motives of the one, so must they be placed on those of the other. If they are judged on the basis of hindsight, however, one conclusion is unchallengeable. Lincoln seized upon the key vulnerability in his rival's position: The Little Giant's repeated statement that he did not care whether the territories voted slavery up or down. Such was not the Senator's true feeling."

Capers believes that in one important respect Douglas overshadowed many of the political figures of the day. He constantly worked to preserve the Union and later to find means to avoid civil strife. To the pursuit of these goals he devoted his creative energy, his brilliant campaigning, his matchless debating, and his personal fortune. But going farther, Capers predicts: "Had Douglas lived, it is quite conceivable that the course of both war and re-

construction might have been somewhat different. . . . By his influence with northern Democrats and his cooperation with Lincoln he could perhaps have shortened the war."

Clearly the biography shows that Douglas employed his speaking skill effectively. The biographer says, "Ambition, intelligence, and skill in debate were all factors in the rapidity of his rise to public leadership in state and nation." Often his public speaking meant the difference between victory and defeat.

This book is not as comprehensive in scope or as rich in detail as George Fort Milton's *Eve of the Conflict*. Unfortunately the book is not footnoted; specific sources therefore cannot be checked. This weakness is overcome somewhat by the excellent section called "A Note on the Sources." Although it is written from a pro-Douglas point of view, this book is in no sense an apologia. It is valuable for its fresh appraisal of the Little Giant and his contemporaries.

WALDO W. BRADEN
Louisiana State University

BENJAMIN HARRISON, HOOSIER STATESMAN: FROM THE CIVIL WAR TO THE WHITE HOUSE, 1865-1888. By Harry J. Sievers, S.J. New York: University Publishers, 1959; pp. xxii+502. $6.00.

This is the second of a projected three-volume biography of Benjamin Harrison. The work is commissioned by the Arthur Jordan Foundation, restorers of the Harrison Memorial Home in Indianapolis.

This is a handsome volume. Wide margins, clear type, and footnotes where they belong, at the foot of the page, make it a pleasure to read.

It is also a useful volume. The sixteen pages of bibliography include a helpful discussion of the available Harrison Manuscripts, and the Index of more than fifty pages is unusually detailed. The reader will learn much of Indiana politics, and, to my surprise, will get a good idea of Harrison the speaker. Father Sievers pays more attention to his subject's speaking than do most historian-biographers.

The fault I find with this book is reflected in Father Sievers' choice of title. Only an exceedingly gentle critic could find the stuff of statesmanship in a senator whose chief legislative contribution was unending bills for veterans' benefits; in a campaigner whose chief cries were protectionism and the bloody shirt; and in an observer of society whose complacent view of the social order of 1888 was reflected in the "repeated contention that America already threw about the workingman social and political safeguards that guaranteed social justice." Much is made of Harrison's personal integrity. Boss Quay said of him that Harrison "would never know how close a number of men were compelled to approach the penitentiary to make him President." I cannot escape the impression that he would have felt it indecorous to ask.

VICTOR M. POWELL
Wabash College

CONGRESS AND THE AMERICAN TRADITION. By James Burnham. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1959; pp. x+363. $6.50.

For those who feel (1) that the Twenty-Second Amendment serves Franklin Roosevelt right, (2) that Harry Truman compounded the elaborate list of FDR's felonies and, for good measure, added a number of his own, *and* (3) that Dwight Eisenhower, far from reversing all this as any sane man would have done, tolerated and even condoned his two immediate predecessors' evil designs on American traditions—for those who can voice a clarion "Hear! Hear!" to *all three* of these, James Burnham's *Congress and the American Tradition* will provide welcome reading and delightful fare.

In James Burnham's opinion, "The government of the United States that existed in 1933 was recognizably the same government that came into existence in 1789" (p. 65). We had had "strong" presidents before 1933, but their strength lay in their "political personality" and "special methods"; since the election of 1932, however, "enduring changes" have been made "in the constitutional nature" of our government (p. 104).

Consistently these changes have been at the expense of the proper repository of power, Congress, and have served to enhance the power of the executive to the point that in Burnham's belief the next step is "Caesarism."

Congress should declare its independence from the executive and write its own legislation; bureaucratic autonomy should be destroyed by substituting appointive for civil service personnel; dozens of governmental functions should be abolished by reducing their appropriations to zero; Congress should reassert its control over the sword by reexamining the size of the armed forces, the amount of foreign aid, and the United States' membership in the United Nations and NATO;

Congress should stop diluting national sovereignty through collective security measures and should enact the Bricker amendment; Congress should reassert its powers of immunity, autonomy, and compulsion in investigation and should demand the end of confidential relationships between the President and his subordinates and of the practice of classified immunity of information.

To deny that the executive power has increased during the past quarter century would be foolhardy on our part; to overlook the reasons and the necessity for this growth of executive power is foolhardy on Burnham's part.

Perhaps it is a shame that our world has become so complicated, but it would be a greater shame to deny its complexity and the United States' responsibilities in it.

ROBERT P. FRIEDMAN
University of Missouri

PROPAGANDA ANALYSIS: A STUDY OF INFERENCES MADE FROM NAZI PROPAGANDA IN WORLD WAR II. By Alexander L. George. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1959; pp. xxii+287. $6.00.

An equally appropriate sub-title might have been, "Drawing Inferences from Inferences from Inferences."

During World War II, the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service (FBIS) of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) was assigned the task of reporting on the broadcasts of other countries, with two thoughts in mind: first, to provide Intelligence with a summary of what was being said by the propagandists; and second, to interpret the intentions and strategy behind the communications.

The analysts so engaged were making their analyses and drawing their inferences under the operational conditions of the war and were subject to the deadlines imposed by those whose job it was to prosecute it. Despite these handicaps, 81% of the FBIS inferences that could be scored proved to be accurate. Alexander George became interested; for though he realized this was not a conclusive demonstration of accuracy in prediction, it none-the-less did invite investigation.

To this end he posed the question: Can a propaganda-analysis code be drafted to enable analysts to improve the accuracy of their inferences?

Available to him were voluminous reports that the FCC had accumulated. Equally valuable, if not more so, were the vast quantities of captured German war records and numerous interviews with leading German officials which helped in documenting the policy intentions and calculations behind their propaganda. Notable among these records was the diary of Mr. Goebbels. Thus Mr. George thought it best to restrict his research to an evaluation of German propaganda releases and the analysts' inferences drawn from them, for it would enable him to check the validity of the inferences against the available historical evidence.

The result is a truly significant contribution to persons seeking a reasonably objective diagnostic tool for making certain kinds of inferences.

Exciting are the twenty major case studies involving Germany and the Allies, of which three are especially fascinating for their many inferences, both false and correct; syllogistic types of reasoning of all varieties; and abundant use of negative evidence, all of which should hold the attention of those especially engaged in teaching argumentation and debate:

Case Study 11.1, p. 140, "German V-Weapon" (A comparison of British and American Propaganda Analysis Techniques).

Case Study 12.1, p. 177, "German Expectation in 1942 of an Allied Second Front Attempt and an Invasion of North Africa."

Case Study 12.2 p. 191, "German Expectation in 1943 of Allied Second Front of Invasions of Sicily and Italy."

W. A. DAHLBERG
University of Oregon

THE ACADEMIC MIND: SOCIAL SCIENTISTS IN TIME OF CRISIS. By Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., with a Field Report by David Riesman. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958; pp. xiv+460. $7.50.

Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Wagner Thielens, Jr., gathered the information for this book in the spring of 1955. The main purpose of the study, as commissioned by the Fund for the Republic, "was to obtain information which could form the basis for intelligent social action."

The study is based on data provided by 2,451 college and university teachers—all social scientists, and hence more likely to deal with controversial topics in their courses—who taught in 165 participating colleges ranging from small private schools to the largest uni-

versities in the nation. The sample seems reasonably representative of higher education in the United States.

It is with this group that the authors confronted their main task: that of describing and analyzing the feelings of academics in the difficult years after World War II, when burgeoning conservatism on the one hand, and McCarthyism and witch hunting on the other, made the life of the college professor something less than desirable.

In ten closely knit chapters, Lazarsfeld and Thielens give such insights into the academic mind as these: that their profession lacked occupational self-esteem; "that they were not especially appreciated by the outside world"; that they are liberal rather than conservative; that their intellectual and academic freedoms were being inhibited; that as a result of the social construct in which they found themselves they were cautious about expressing controversial opinions; that on many occasions they were "requested" by administrative officials "to avoid controversial topics, to refrain from political activity, to make contributions to the 'right' political activities, to avoid unfavorable reference to school benefactors, to increase their contacts with students, to decrease their contacts with students, and so on"; and finally that though there was "indeed widespread apprehension, . . . the heads of these men and women are bloody but unbowed."

Although there is no clear call for effective social action to remedy these evils, the authors make a modest appeal for reform. "It would be dangerous," they conclude, "to have the effective scope of the American college campus restricted again. . . . And so with questions of academic freedom. . . . Many citizens who believed they were serving the security of their country by attacking college professors probably did not realize that, in doing so, they endangered an important development in American higher education."

A lengthy chapter by David Riesman entitled, "Some Observations on the Interviewing," closes the book. The gist here is that although the procedure contained some deficiencies, they did not seriously impair the information gathered.

Some conclusions of a critical nature have already been suggested. As an over-all estimate it is necessary to state that *The Academic Mind*, although laudable in purpose and definitive in method, suffers somewhat by dint of that definitiveness. One is discouraged by the multitudinous graphs, the lengthy explanations, the explication of method. As a result one audience toward which the book is aimed, "the outsider," will lay it down before any real knowledge of the academic psyche is gained.

As a source book for the experimentally minded field theoretician, it is examplary; as a benchmark for further investigation into the field, it is useful; as an attempt to communicate effectively to the general public the complexities of the mind of the college professor and his response to criticism from outside the campus, however, it leaves much to be desired.

ANTHONY HILLBRUNER
Los Angeles State College

THEATRE ARTS PUBLICATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES 1947-1952: A FIVE YEAR BIBLIOGRAPHY. Compiled and edited by William W. Melnitz. East Lansing, Mich.: American Educational Theatre Association, 1959; pp. xiv+91. $3.00.

In *Theatre Arts Publications in the United States 1947-1952*, William Melnitz has attempted to list in 4,063 titles every book and article on the theatre and related media that appeared in the United States and Canada during the five year period. As Edward C. Cole states in his foreword, "Compiling bibliography is not among the most glamorous or exciting kinds of scholarship but it is among the most exacting and certainly among the most appreciated." Our appreciation, indeed, must go out to Professor Melnitz for his labor of love and devotion over the past ten years. Within the limits set by the publishers, the American Educational Theatre Association, the publication will serve as a welcome central reference for theatre students.

Of course there are the inevitable lapses in accuracy which seem intrinsic to bibliography. A few examples: "E. Bravely" must be Ernest Bavely, "Monroe Lipman" should be Lippman, "Richard" G. Smith is properly Raymond, and "Louis" R. Norvelle surely is Lee. These are nits surely. There are, however, unfortunate drawbacks in matters of organization and classification which diminish the publication's effectiveness as a research tool for the theatre scholar. Professor Melnitz has chosen to list all entries in the main divisions of the bibliography alphabetically by *subject*, an arrangement which works out well, and to list all entries in the subdivisions alphabetically by *author*, an arrangement which does not

always work out well, for the results of this inconsistency are often time-consuming and unwieldy, especially in the larger subdivisions. For example, the student seeking information on O'Neill would certainly find it faster under the subject heading *O'Neill, Eugene* than he will in this alphabetical listing of authors in which can be found interspersed an occasional article on this dramatist (#141—Downer, Alan S. "Eugene O'Neill as Poet of the Theatre," etc.). Similarly, the student whose quest is Racine must scan the pages until entry #230, listed not under the subject *Racine* but under Denis Jaurat, the article's author, before he will discover something. The researcher coming upon Francis Fergusson's *Idea of a Theatre* (#649) must read on until entry #715 to find the listing of a review of the book by Wylie Sypher in *Poetry* because Sypher falls so much further along the alphabet than Fergusson. And how does one cope with the obscurity of #1565: MacKaye, Milton, "Broadway Says He's a Genius," *Saturday Evening Post,* etc.? A subject heading would at least identify the genius. Similarly, "Magazine or newspaper articles that have no author listed are entered under anonymous, alphabetically by title." Result: each subdivision begins with a list of anonymously authored articles on diverse matters whose only claim to unity is the general all-embracing classification. How much more useful would be entry #109, Anonymous, "Eliot Recorded," *Newsweek,* etc., if it were found under the heading *Eliot, T.S.* or *Recorded Drama?*

The lack of cross references all the more emphasizes the cumbrousness of the plan. (Utility is further hindered by an author index which provides page numbers—each page in the bibliography may have as many as fifty entries—rather than the specific entry number itself.) For some reason about the only entries cross-referenced are articles in *Shakespeare Survey,* which are set down individually by author and also, to no apparent working end, are cross-referenced to "Nicoll, Allardyce," editor, an inconsistent and wasteful procedure which is comparable to listing all articles from *Shakespeare Quarterly* under James G. McManaway because he is editor of the American counterpart journal. Indeed, one wonders why articles in *Shakespeare Survey,* a British annual, are even included in this bibliography whose domain, according to its editor, is restricted to items that "appeared in the United States and Canada." Qualifications for the inclusion of other items seem as arbitrary as they are elastic, and a number of British authored and printed books are included while some items by Americans published in England are omitted (C. B. Hogan's *Shakespeare In The Theatre,* Oxford, 1952).

Classification is often equally erratic. Example: G. W. Stone's "David Garrick's Significance in the History of Shakespearean Criticism" (#417) properly appears under the classification *Shakespeare,* but his "Garrick's Production of *King Lear*" (#541) is reserved for the classification *Periods.*

Admittedly some of these flaws are minor, but regrettably some of them become major when one considers that the virtue of any bibliography is measured in great part by the degree of its expediency for the user. Compiling bibliography is demanding and exacting, and Professor Melnitz should be commended for herculean effort well beyond what should be expected of any one man in this type of endeavor. Unfortunately the shortcomings of the bibliography prevent what is now an impressive and valuable publication (AETA's first monograph) from becoming an unqualified professional landmark for its publisher and editor.

KALMAN A. BURNIM
University of Pittsburgh

THE SOVEREIGN FLOWER. . . . By G. Wilson Knight. Indexes composed by Patricia M. Ball. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 321. $6.00.

SHAKESPEARE'S FESTIVE COMEDY: A STUDY OF DRAMATIC FORM AND ITS RELATION TO SOCIAL CUSTOM. By C. L. Barber. Princeton University Press, 1959; pp. x+266. $5.00.

Readers who have learned to expect from Professor Knight great intelligence, frequent flashes of true brilliance, and an always provocative stand on Shakespeare will not be disappointed with this latest work. Indeed, those who already own Knight's other Shakespearean studies will certainly want this volume, for it includes indexes to all his past work. But that *The Sovereign Flower* (*Macbeth,* V,ii,29) possesses all those qualities which have placed Knight in such high regard over the years is not to say that it does not stand apart from his other books. There is an extraordinary self-consciousness about this book which the reader must himself judge.

This can be regarded as both capstone and swan song ("This is the last, and likely to re-

main the last, of my Shakespearean studies.") to an illustrious three decades of literary criticism (Knight would prefer the word "interpretation"). Of greatest interest is an excellent essay in which the "spatial" approach is applied to *All's Well that Ends Well*. The only other new chapter is an interesting one on Shakespeare's use of names. The rest of the book is a record of research Knight has done on Knight, a reprinting of early essays. The main ones are: "The Sceptred Isle," a study of England, Shakespeare, and the Crown (first published as *The Olive and the Sword*); and "The Shakespearean Integrity," a study of Shakespeare's integrity to and understanding of the human condition.

While "festive comedy" will mean little to those who have not read Professor Barber, the book's sub-title—*A Study of Dramatic Form and its Relation to Social Custom*—amply informs the reader of the *genre* of the work. More specifically, Barber seeks ritualistic influences in *Love's Labours Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice, Henry IV, As You Like It,* and *Twelfth Night*. These according to Barber are festive comedies. What is festive comedy? ". . . all comedy, if the word is pressed far enough." This, then, is one of the main faults of the book; we never learn what *is not* festive comedy.

The book sets out to show "that the holiday occasion and the comedy are parallel manifestations of the same pattern of culture"; but not very convincingly. Barber's suggestion that Shakespeare was aware of folk ritual (how could he escape awareness?) is reasonable; but he is less so when he claims that Shakespeare "consciously" made plays out of social pastimes.

The work smacks more of a collection of already published articles than a unified book. The best chapter—thrice published—is on *Henry IV*. Falstaff becomes Lord of Misrule and Scapegoat. Hal's rejection of him is "purification by sacrifice." Again, by turning on Falstaff the Scapegoat Hal can rid himself of "bad luck." This is very interesting, but why did Barber overlook Dionysus' rejection of Silenus, a more likely parallel than the one he posits?

Barber's style is seldom precise and it is sometimes vague to the point of incomprehensibility. What can the following string of words possibly mean? "The extraordinary thing about the poised liberty of the second act is that the reduction of life to the natural and seasonal and physical works all the more convincingly as a festive release by including a recognition that the physical can be unpleasant" (p. 225). And in an important summary sentence we read: "It appears that comedy uses ritual in the process of redefining ritual as the expression of particular personalities in particular circumstances" (p. 220). One must ponder that sentence before he realizes finally that it is meaningless.

ALBERT B. WEINER
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

THE BROKEN COMPASS: A STUDY OF THE MAJOR COMEDIES OF BEN JONSON. By Edward B. Partridge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958; pp. 254. $4.25.

Mr. Partridge scrutinizes the technique of the poet Jonson to discover the playwright's achievement. The image central to his study is the circle which the character Perfectio seeks to describe in Jonson's *The Masque of Beauty*. Partridge comments, "But in the impresse—and this is the revealing part—the compass is broken, so that the circle is incapable of perfection." With this image of aspiration in mind, Mr. Partridge describes that triptych of comedies, *Volpone, The Alchemist,* and *Epicoen;* more cursorily, he sketches those minor masterpieces, *The Staple of Newes, The New Inne,* and *The Magnetick Lady*.

Partridge cleaves closely to analysis of imagery, for he abides by Mark Schorer's truth that, "When we speak of technique . . . we speak of nearly everything. For technique is the means by which the writer's experience, which is his subject matter, compels him to attend to it; technique is the only means he has of discovering, exploring, developing his subject, of conveying its meaning, and, finally, of evaluating it."

The scholar does best with what seems Jonson's best play—and I realize this is a minority opinion—*Volpone*. Surely, *Volpone's* confluent themes of greed, lust, and bestiality bestow no laugh-riot. But, if *The Merchant of Venice* and *Measure for Measure*—those dark and discouraging visions—are comedies, then so must be *Volpone*. Corrupt Justice in the Venice of Jonson's play festers even more than in Shakespeare's measureful Viennese cesspool—or the Paris in all of Molière. Throughout *Volpone*, one witnesses the inequities of Law and learns

that Justice, like the Ritz Hotel, is open to everyone.

In a traditional way, Partridge sees *Volpone* as a beast-fable. Volpone is the covetous fox, Mosca the bloodsucking fly, Voltore the preying lawyer. Partridge suggests Jonson has confused the analogical matrices of Corbaccio and Corvini: that Corbaccio, that ancient "hog-louse," should be the crow, and Corvino, who would throw his own wife's body into the struggle for inheritance, is *really* the raven.

Aside from shoving the characters into the right cage of the human zoo—and Mr. Partridge is astute enough to eschew any simple-minded equivalences—he demonstrates how the corrupt images of bed and court, of sex and society, make for the altogether rotten Venice of *Volpone*. Blackness is all; and doubtless that is what confers the lasting fascination of the play. Though we have extant from the Jonson canon, by 1598, only the outrageously funny "Italian" version of *Every Man in His Humor*, Francis Meres may have been righter than generations of critics have given him credit for, when, in that year, he acknowledged Ben Jonson as being a writer of tragedy.

Yet, incrediby, *Volpone* is a comedy. Horace Walpole reminds us that life may be a tragedy for those who feel, but it is a comedy to those who think. A few words of summary by Mr. Partridge may serve to clarify:

> Jonson . . . characteristically establishes and maintains a comic tone largely, though not solely, by means of diction. Without the aesthetic distance and the comic detachment which this diction gives us, the actions in most Jonsonian plays might well be unbearably sordid or sinister or pathetic. But, by means of epithets, allusions, metaphors, and precisely chosen words, Jonson gives us the proper comic perspective: cold, hard, and merciless, yet clear, free of cant and massively controlled.

Jonson's work has been said to stink of the lamp. Partridge shows that the playwright's erudition, though somewhat less than thought before, remains enormous. Ambiguously, *Volpone* is inscribed to Oxford and Cambridge.

We know that Jonson patronized Shakespeare for having "small Latin and less Greek." Jonson, in his *Discoveries*, has written of Shakespeare: "He said in the person of Caesar, one speaking to him; 'Caesar, thou dost me wrong.' He replied: 'Caesar did never wrong, but with just cause.'" A magnificent paradox. Then, presumably at Jonson's behest, Shakespeare blotted his line to read: "Know, Caesar doth not wrong, nor without cause/Will he be satisfied." (*Julius Caesar:* III:1). Logical, perhaps, but less alive.

Similarly, scholar Jonson's preoccupation with learning often got dramatist Jonson into trouble. There are the silly, encumbering citations to the historians Tacitus and Suetonius in *Sejanus;* and Jonson had, unfortunately, mixed himself up with his cherished Horace in the earlier *Poetaster*. Nevertheless, Partridge restores the poet whom some literary historians have cluttered with scholarship. By plumbing the imagery of the comedies, Partridge has drawn—not really paradoxically—a darker, but more human, Jonson. We can grasp, even if we don't agree with, the taste of those who ranked Jonson with Shakespeare.

John Dryden, writing more than a half century after Jonson's death, bracketed Jonson and Shakespeare. If genius is unique, then there can be no competition between the two poets. Partridge's close explication of metaphor in Jonson's comedies corroborates the judgment of Dryden who so shrewdly paid joint homage to the two writers:

> Peace be to the venerable shades of Shakespeare and Ben Jonson! none of the living will presume to have any competition with them; as they were our predecessors, so were they our masters.

HERBERT FEINSTEIN
University of California, Berkeley

J. M. SYNGE, 1871-1909. By David H. Greene and Edward M. Stephens. New York: Macmillan, 1959; pp. xiv+321. $6.95.

Admirers of J. M. Synge and the Irish theatre will welcome this detailed, objective analysis of Synge's personal life and professional career based on hitherto unavailable sources.

When Edward M. Stephens, Synge's nephew and heir, died in 1955, David H. Greene acquired access to the papers in Synge's estate and to the materials Stephens had collected for a biography of his uncle. After additional research in Ireland, Greene wrote this first authorized biography—a full-length portrait in contrast to Maurice Bourgeois' earlier work and William Butler Yeats' concise *Synge and the Ireland of His Time*.

Although Yeats' personal impressions of Synge as a "drifting silent man full of hidden passion" can hardly be surpassed, Greene's scholarly reporting of abundant evidence yields

fresh insights into Ireland's dramatic genius and his frustrations. Born into a family of landowners and churchmen at a time when Ireland was seething with patriotic and religious fervor, Synge early found himself at odds with his environment because of his unorthodox views on religion and his indifference to politics. Until the age of twenty-seven, he drifted from one interest to another—natural science, music, Irish antiquities, foreign languages, literary criticism—studying at Trinity College and the Royal Irish Academy of Music and living in Germany, Italy, and France.

His visit to the Aran Islands in 1898 "converted a man of ostensibly mediocre talent, a complete failure, in fact, into a writer of genius." From his close associations with Irish peasants came his travel sketches and poems, but more important, the ideas for his six plays and the inspiration for the rich imagery and lilting rhythm of his dialogue. An untimely death cut short his playwriting career and his romance with actress Molly Allgood.

Without slighting Synge's personal life, Greene's biography concentrates on the playwright's professional efforts and his associations with Yeats, Lady Gregory, Douglas Hyde, the Fays, and others in the Irish Theatre Movement. Especially valuable are excerpts from Synge's letters giving his views on drama and "national" theatre. The climax of the book is a vivid accounting of the anti-Synge riots that accompanied the performances of his masterpiece, *The Playboy of the Western World*, in 1907—demonstrations that originated in 1903 when Irish Nationalists found his first play, *In the Shadow of the Glen*, antithetical to their interests.

ROBERT R. CROSBY
Ohio Wesleyan University

THE LITERARY SYMBOL. By William York Tindall. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958; pp. vii+278. $4.50.

This book should be included in the library of all teachers of interpretation. In clear and pleasing prose, the author has presented an analysis and appreciation of the literary symbol. An eclectic, Mr. Tindall acknowledges his debt to Lyman Bryson, Kenneth Burke, Margaret Mead, Susanne Langer, Ernst Cassirer, and others for the formation and improvement of his ideas of the symbol. His interest is that of neither a philosopher nor a moralist. Rather he is a critic who, while welcoming authority, bases definition upon illustration. His illustrations are drawn from Joyce, Faulkner, Proust, Gerard Manley Hopkins, Thomas Mann, and the French symbolist poets. His method is indicated by his discussion of Faulkner's test of symbol in *As I Lay Dying*. "However local the journey of Pa's company and however limited its object, its meanings are general; for their journey is that of life, their goal a grave. Rising from her coffin, Ma speaks of 'significant shape,' words that together with 'myriad,' Faulkner's favorite, describe the journey and its meanings."

The organization is set forth in the preface: "This discourse on what is not altogether beyond it begins with an approach to definition and proceeds with history. Analysis of parts, such as image, action, and structure, occupies the center and contemplation of form, the end." An index, but no bibliography, is included.

Weakness of organization mars the discussion of historical development, and the distinction between image and symbol is not clearly drawn. Nevertheless, the study offers valuable insight into the nature of the symbol, and its illustrations will delight any reader interested in the symbol or in illustrative writers.

FRANCES LEA MCCURDY
University of Missouri

COMING OF AGE: NEW AND SELECTED POEMS. By Babette Deutsch. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959; pp. 160. $3.95.

Poetry is the music poets make of their interests. Those of us who think that until the reader can identify the interests it is mighty hard for him to hear any music, will be grateful for the poems of Babette Deutsch.

She declares her interests, and her subjects, quite explicitly—praising rationality, courage in the old, innocence in the young, Mozart's music, great painting, wine, sun baths, poetry, good conversation, friendship and love, variety in landscape and weather, and staying up late at night. Also she offers poems in dispraise of violence and cruelty, spiritual dullness, death, madness, and people who interrupt one's thinking with unsolicited visits.

These are the "ordinary" values, one might think, of those rather extraordinary persons whose gusto for experience, whose pleasures and pains, though deeply felt, serve under the competent presidency of the spirit of moderation. In short, Babette Deutsch's is a poetry of

the adult intelligence, evoking a world of civilized values for our sharing. Almost, at times, I think of this body of poems as a kind of copious feeling-tone index of good Humanist doctrine—though I am, after all, pleased to note that the poet is altogether too outdoorsy for the doctrinal Humanist.

I do not intend a sportsman's metaphor. I am thinking, rather, of such seriously alive Humanists as I've known who seem never to know what to make of the weather, who are in fact stunned by the weather as by a condition which makes reading difficult—breezes blowing up the pages annoyingly and sunlight making the type spotty. Miss Deutsch does numerous lovely things with the weather, improving marvelously on what I at least dully observe of its real motions, and it is not the least of her magic to reveal landscapes and seascapes that shine all the more splendidly for not having morals in them.

Qualities of moderation, control, and exact observation—pleasures for the reader—present certain special challenges to the oral interpreter. If the prototypical attitude of these poems is contemplative and meditative, the oral interpreter, facing his living audience for an hour, is likely to think practically that living audiences, poor things, seem able to bear only so much meditation. Still, frequently the contemplations are gaudy and a number of the poems shake perilously close to the speaker's control-barrier, so that several appealing programs might be planned from the plenitude offered here.

There are over a hundred poems in all, seventy-eight chosen by Miss Deutsch from her earlier volumes, fifteen new poems, and twenty-two poems which are translations from Baudelaire, Rilke, Pasternak, Pushkin, and others.

DON GEIGER
University of California, Berkeley

LITERATURE AS EXPERIENCE. By Wallace A. Bacon and Robert S. Breen. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959; pp. xii+325. $5.00.

As its title suggests, this collaboration maintains "that correspondences between *actual* experience which life presents and *virtual* experience which literature presents [should] be reinstated in all their primitive force." The authors intend their book to be used, together with an anthology of literature, as a basic text for courses in oral interpretation.

Literature as Experience deserves attention. It may help to offset the influence, damaging to the status of interpretation as a serious academic discipline, of the too many textbooks which instruct the student *how* to interpret literature, but leave to him the far tougher problem: discovering what literature is. Professors Bacon and Breen do not make this mistake. Literature for them is something more than illustrative snippets yanked out of proper contexts.

To demonstrate how literature in various ways imitates the experiences of life, often the experiences of the reader's own life, they define "The Nature of Experience," "The Nature of Literature," and finally "Literature and Expressive Action." The first of these sections employs the vocabulary of behaviorist psychology to relate the individual's physical and emotional nature with his capacity to participate in the aesthetic experience of literature. The second and longest section of the book is devoted to literary analysis, and contains discerning appraisals of a poem ("Snake," by D. H. Lawrence), a story (Hemingway's "A Clean, Well-Lighted Place"), and a short play ("Hello Out There," by William Saroyan). The remaining section deals briefly with verbal and gestured action implied in the language of literature. Pertinent questions to the student follow each chapter.

Some textbooks can be judged only provisionally until tested by classroom use. *Literature as Experience* is such a book. Much as I admire its brave intentions, I seriously doubt it would persuade students that the reading of literature is "an active revelation rather than a passive toleration." Anatomizing both life and literature, it makes neither especially attractive or exciting. The authors quote with sometimes pedantic eagerness from a great number of psychologists, critics, and aestheticians. The book is conscientious and meticulous in outline; but unfortunately many of its pages are rather dull.

JONATHAN W. CURVIN
University of Wisconsin

MANUAL OF PHONETICS. Edited by L. Kaiser. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1957; pp. xv+460. $10.00.

The first thing one has to do is disabuse his mind of any preconception of what a manual ought to be. As a collection of writings on subjects which might interest those who are in one part of their wholeness phoneticians, Kaiser's *Manual* is interesting.

The first three parts, 212 pp., are by cap-

tion—A: History of Phonetics, B: Basal Sciences of Phonetics, C: Phonetic Research—of manual type. The B wording unfortunately suggests that there is no science of phonetics. In this part the title of the third essay, Gemelli and Black's "Phonetics from the viewpoint of psychology," suggests an evaluating rather than basal relationship, and the fourth essay, "Statistical methods in phonetics," condensed to futility as compared with Newman's articles elsewhere, has nothing to do with phonetics if the first two essays, Arnold's fairly long and thoroughly technical "Morphology and physiology of the speech organs" and French's similar "Auditory considerations," in any way define the field. In Part C, Peterson's four little essays look rather as though he had pulled out from extensive files a number of cards, some research findings, some details of experimentation, some schemata, and quite a few just notes on what to say to students; Barney and Dunn's two essays on speech analysis and synthesis sketch orderlily and in proportion what are currently the more exciting instrumental procedures; Subtelny, Pruzansky, and Subtelny brighten the essay in between, on Roentgenography, with illustrated emphasis on one of the techniques they cover.

Part D has an unhappy caption, Phonetics in Relation to Linguistics, like the label prelinguistic frequently put on phonetics in America. For my money, as personally wagered as many of the essays are written, phoneticians can find more direction for probing, not accepting but testing, in Jakobson and Halle's general essay here than in anything else in the book. Martinet on linguistic evolution is for the historical minded. The other essays in this part are on specific language groups.

Part E is Phonetics in its Relation to Other Sciences: pathology, sociology, music, and aesthetics. Part F is Phonetics and the Origin of Speech: Irwin's longish essay, full of experimental apparatus, on development in childhood, a pleasant essay without apparatus on development in mankind, and three pages on general semantics (not General Semantics).

The right of several authors to be chosen for the job is bolstered by the number of their own works cited in the ample reference lists appended to the essays; as bibliographies the lists are marred by the failure to give titles for articles spotted in periodicals. Of the thirty authors, fourteen, mostly named above, have addresses in the USA; two of these are members of the SAA. It seems a bit odd that none is from Great Britain, where phonetics seems to be moderately respectable.

LEE S. HULTZÉN
University of Edinburgh

TOWARD UNDERSTANDING STUTTERING. By Wendell Johnson. Chicago: National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, 1959; pp. 36. Paper $.25.

THE ONSET OF STUTTERING: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS. By Wendell Johnson *et al.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1959; pp. xvi+276+243. $5.00.

These recent contributions by Wendell Johnson differ in content and purpose but have a common foundation in research conducted at the University of Iowa. The pamphlet, *Toward Understanding Stuttering*, is designed primarily for parents; the two-part book, *The Onset of Stuttering*, is intended for professional and research workers.

The importance of the parents as listeners is stressed in the booklet published by the National Society. From his own background, Dr. Johnson draws illustrations to explain stuttering in a way that most parents can understand. He discusses the beginnings of stuttering, urges parents to regard hesitancy as a normal part of development, and explains the essential roles played by mothers and fathers in making the wonder of speech "a source of strength and joy and wisdom" for their children. He concludes, on an optimistic note, that "there is increasing reason to believe that in the future the problem of stuttering will be reduced—and, with good fortune, it might in some far distant time be all but eliminated."

The Onset of Stuttering summarizes two of the Iowa research studies that were reported in detail in earlier publications and presents the most recent investigation—Study III—in detail. The 300 children used for Study III included 150 who were alleged to be stutterers and 150 non-stuttering children matched for age, sex, and socioeconomic level. The fathers and mothers of these children were interviewed, each being asked approximately 800 questions about the child's birth and development and the parents' socioeconomic status, attitudes concerning the child's speech, and disciplinary attitudes and practices. Additional investigation determined the conditions under which the children in the experimental group began to stutter, the reactions to the speech be-

havior that was regarded as stuttering, and the development of the problem after its onset. Sub-group comparisons of the experimental population and study of MMPI profiles of most of the parents, together with analyses of recorded samples of the children's speech, provided further information.

Summarizing all of these data must have posed a most difficult task to the investigators. They make use of 80 tabular presentations in the first half of the book to indicate findings from the various areas of questioning; they present discussions of their procedures and data; they provide a chapter in summary and a chapter stating their conclusions. Their list of references includes 134 citations. The appendices, occupying 243 of the total of 519 pages in the book, present data from Study II and Study III in a detailed manner, "to allow essential reference to them in the body of the report and to encourage further evaluation of them and continued development of their implications."

Each of these publications can serve a useful purpose. The speech pathologist who accepts Johnson's point of view will find *Toward Understanding Stuttering* a helpful guide in directing the thinking of parents who have classified their children as stutterers. The pamphlet can be used to best advantage as a basis for parent counseling, since some parents might have difficulty in understanding the many—and perhaps unfamiliar—concepts without an opportunity to discuss them. The informal style, the interesting turns of phrase, and the personal approach make the pamphlet readable and interesting.

The report of research on the onset of stuttering, in spite of its formidable appendices and detailed tables, or perhaps because of them, can be a source of information for thoughtful consideration by professional workers. It is not for the layman nor for the parent, but it is filled with facts and figures that should challenge the attention and stimulate the interest of the serious student of speech pathology.

CHARLOTTE G. WELLS
University of Missouri

ORAL INTERPRETATION. (Second edition.) By Charlotte I. Lee. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959; pp. x+564. $4.75.

In this edition, the author continues her careful analysis and synthesis of literature and the problems involved in artistic oral interpretation. Parts One, Three, and Four are essentially the same, but Part Two, "The Interpretation of Prose," is changed. The chapter on exposition has been replaced by a chapter on "The Essay." Within certain chapters rearrangement of sub-headings has been made which provides a more effective and interesting manner of development. The rewriting that has been done is in keeping with Dr. Lee's straightforward manner and clear organization. Approximately 20-25% of the "Suggested Material for Analysis and Oral Interpretation" is new. The selections are stimulating and challenging to the interpreter. The neat format gives the new edition greater eye appeal and better framing for the pages.

L. LAMONT OKEY
The University of Michigan

THE CEREBRAL-PALSIED CHILD: A GUIDE FOR PARENTS. By Winthrop M. Phelps, Thomas W. Hopkins, and Robert Cousins. Foreword by Frances R. Horwich and Introduction by Dean W. Roberts. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958; pp. xiv+237. $3.95.

The parents of a cerebral-palsied child often are confronted with questions that require answers from an expert. Many of the same questions occur to the speech therapist who, without extensive knowledge of the disorder, is requested to help. The authors provide information and advice regarding the problems of the cerebral-palsied child at home, at play, and at school. More important, perhaps, they explore the emotional adjustments of the child and his parents. Topics discussed include physical and occupational therapy, as well as speech therapy. Within the comprehensive scope of this volume, aids to treatment such as orthopedic surgery, drug therapy, braces, and other mechanical aids are explained.

An outstanding name in cerebral palsy diagnosis and training, Winthrop M. Phelps, M.D., is head of the Children's Rehabilitation Institute, which he founded near Baltimore in 1937. Thomas W. Hopkins, Ph.D., Principal of the A. Harry Moore School, a school for handicapped children in Jersey City, and Robert Cousins, an editor, have collaborated in presenting Dr. Phelps' concepts and theories and their application. In the endeavor to educate laymen, the authors present information in a lucid style and vocabulary. At no time is information distorted in order to inspire the reader to unrealistic aspirations. The facts are reported in a candid manner with little room for false hopes.

The speech therapist seeking suggestions for the improvement of his methods will be disappointed by this book. Although speech therapy is recognized as of primary importance, the presentation of the therapeutic techniques is not a purpose of the authors. Indeed, some statements concerning speech problems will give rise to objections from speech pathologists who do not subscribe to the cerebral dominance theory of stuttering.

Such objections are minimized by the over-all worth of the volume. Speech pathologists and their students will welcome this comprehensive aid in understanding the problems common to the cerebral-palsied child. The greatest value of the book is obviously that for which it was designed: to provide information to parents and their counselors.

EDMUND C. NUTTALL
Cornell University

THE AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL TODAY: A FIRST REPORT TO INTERESTED CITIZENS. By James Bryant Conant. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959; pp. xvi+40. Paper $1.00.

This is a report of a two-year study sponsored by the Educational Testing Service with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. James Bryant Conant set out to discover whether the American Comprehensive High School can fulfill three functions: (1) provide a good general education for all pupils as future citizens in a democracy, (2) provide elective programs for the majority to develop useful skills, (3) educate adequately those with a talent for handling advanced academic subjects—particularly foreign languages and advanced mathematics. He examined 103 high schools in eighteen states and found eight which in his judgment could serve as models. In twenty-one recommendations, Mr. Conant refers to academic studies which should be required and to elective subjects which should be encouraged, but he makes no direct reference to courses in speech.

He does, however, recognize the importance of developing democratic citizenship. He recommends the discussion of controversial issues in social studies; election of class officers and representatives to student council; reports to the student body; and home rooms organized in significant social units. He believes such activities help to train intelligent voters and distinguish our schools from those in totalitarian nations.

Having noted that almost without exception those students elected to the student council or to class offices are in the group of the more academically able who are preparing to go on to college, it is surprising that Mr. Conant does not suggest how the average or even below average student may in high school lay the foundation for adult democratic citizenship by improving: voice, communicative behavior, speech composition, audience control, discussion, oral reading, and an understanding of parliamentary law.

Clearly in a first report all desirable subjects cannot be scheduled. It may be that Mr. Conant assumes that speech can be taught in part of the 50% of the time in English not given over to written composition; or in the seven- or eight-period school day; or in the consolidated high school with its staff of superior teachers. Certainly Mr. Conant's school board, superintendent, and principal cannot create and maintain the *Ideal* Comprehensive High School, if education in oral communication is ignored.

GLADYS L. BORCHERS
University of Wisconsin

HOW TO HOLD A BETTER MEETING. By Frank Snell. Illustrations by Rupert Witalis. New York: Harper, 1958; pp. x+148. Text $2.25.

Snell writes for "the executive who faces four hours of meetings starting at 9:15 tomorrow." The style is breezy, the line drawings humorous and vivid. If the reader needs reminding of things he knows and a few positive suggestions to help him apply them, this book is valuable. If he relies only on this book, he is lost.

Time is of the essence in meetings because time means money in business. Snell's suggestions are time-savers; e.g., use as few men as possible in meetings, circulate an agenda the day before, etc. They are not, he notes, a substitute for pre-meeting preparation. He urges strong leadership to avoid time-wasting. Leadership needs range from authoritarian control in the report meeting, through slightly less control in decision-making and creative-thinking meetings, to "guidance" in the training meeting. His approach is problem-centered, not personnel-relations centered.

The "Solution Wheel" is suggested as an aid to problem-solving. Hints on types of contributions (fact, evaluation, policy), types of support needed to substantiate an assertion, and listening to be sure of meaning before disagreeing all follow textbook principles. Snell sug-

gests consultation with a "speech specialist" if the voice is not an aid to effective expression.

This is not a book for classes, even adult classes. It is, as Snell says, for your business friends who have knowledge and experience, but need a refresher.

HENRY L. EWBANK, JR.
Purdue University

BRIEFING AND CONFERENCE TECHNIQUES. By Glenn M. Loney. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959; pp. xii+194. $3.95.

The author's stated purpose is to bring together "the closely related skills of public speaking, employing audio-visual aids, briefing and conferencing." He states that the book should be regarded as a "summary of principles," rather than an exhaustive study. The jacket blurb refers to the book as both a "text" and a "handbook" and this inconsistency marks the whole presentation. Too handbookish for a text, and not detailed enough for a handbook, the book hits some high spots, but, in general, adds little to speech literature.

The book is divided into four sections. The first section (31 pages) deals with public speaking. Because of its brevity, the section conveys the impression that public speaking is simple and reducible to a table of rules and regulations. Persons trained in speech can recognize its sketchy character, but to the layman it appears as a "do it yourself treatment."

Section Two (60 pages) is a detailed discussion of visual aids and their use in public speaking. Excellent illustrative examples of types of visual aids are provided, but the section tends to lose its force because of the rulebook nature of the material dealing with the use of visual aids. This section is supplemented by a good bibliography of audio-visual materials in the Appendix.

Section Three (40 pages) presents a clear statement of oral and written briefing methods. This material is covered thoroughly with clear examples and represents a constructive contribution.

Section Four (55 pages) attempts to present a complete account of the discussion process, in addition to more "how to do it" rules.

While acceptable for auxiliary reading, Loney's book is weakened by a preoccupation with rules and lists. In "Briefing," he shows real strength. If this section were expanded into a full-length book, something of value would be added to the field.

GERALD PHILLIPS
Washington State University

EFFECTIVE SPEECH FOR DEMOCRATIC LIVING. By Robert T. Oliver. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1959; pp. xii+112. $2.50.

In his preface to this book, the author appears to be rather on the defensive about its brevity. He needn't be. In slightly more than one hundred pages, he has produced a text which merits careful consideration by all who are teaching courses where it might be desirable to limit the length of the reading material. Those who have struggled with tired adults in evening classes especially will recognize its values.

The author has divided his book into ten chapters covering the basic fundamentals of speech with a high level of efficiency and readability. Three of the chapters are outstanding. In the third chapter, "The Right Attitude for Effective Speaking," he treats ethical proof with a vividness seldom encountered today. Chapters four and nine, respectively entitled "How to be a Good Listener" and "How to Conduct a Discussion," present excellent brief explorations of these areas. Only the tenth chapter which deals with parliamentary meetings is disappointing. The author finds himself able to scratch only the surface in the brief space allotted, and the resulting discussion leaves far too many questions unanswered to be very useful.

Because of the book's brevity, classes will need supplementary suggestions, explanations, and examples. But the book is sound, and should serve admirably when used by an active, experienced teacher.

LLOYD I. WATKINS
Ohio University

CORRECT SPEAKING. By John H. Williams, S.J., et al. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958; pp. ix+113. $1.28.

ADULT SPEAKING. By John H. Williams, S.J. et al. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958; pp. ix+94. $1.28.

EFFECTIVE SPEAKING. By John H. Williams, S.J., et al. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958; pp. ix+94. $1.28.

PLANNED SPEAKING. By John H. Williams, S.J., et al. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958; pp. x+83. $1.28.

These four volumes were composed by a group of Jesuit priests for use in Jesuit high schools. Each volume is designed to encompass a full year's work. The graphic arts are well served. Illustrations, type, and layout all seem planned with the goal of being attractive to the high school boy.

The texts are well planned, readable, and filled with numerous, apt examples. At the end of each volume a list of topics is presented for use throughout the school year.

Although constructed on fundamentally sound rhetorical principles, the treatment of theory tends to be sketchy. However, the books would be acceptable if used to supplement an adequate classroom curriculum presided over by a competent instructor.

The publication of this quartet represents a significant advance for speech education in Jesuit high schools. It is hoped that their success will justify their expansion in the future.

The volumes were prepared for use in a specific educational environment within the framework of a highly structured educational philosophy. Whatever shortcomings they might present to the professional speech educator, the texts are suited to their particular audience.

FRANCIS E. X. DANCE
St. Joseph's College (Indiana)

YOUR SPEECH REVEALS YOUR PERSONALITY. By Dominick A. Barbara. Foreword by Nolan D. C. Lewis. Springfield, Ill.: C. C. Thomas, 1958; pp. xviii+174. $5.50.

THE ART OF LISTENING. By Dominick A. Barbara. Springfield, Ill.: C. C. Thomas, 1958; pp. x+201. $5.50.

These two significant books, written by a practicing psychoanalyst, deal with a theme of great concern for teachers and students of speech—namely, that effective communication requires insight and emotional stability. The lack of such by anyone (provoked by conflict within and/or pressures without) disrupts both speaking and listening, for talking and listening are not entities apart. Each reflects the innermost fears, anxieties, and conditions of emotional stability of the person involved. "The poor listener," says the author, "is likely to be a poor talker as well."

The business of communication—whether reception or transmission—begins within the individual. "Every speaker," says Dr. Barbara, "inevitably talks from within himself and, unavoidably, about himself and his innermost feelings." He continues to say, "We cannot attempt to understand or comprehend others until we learn to listen effectively to ourselves." The less organized, the less rational the inner psychological structure, the more disorganized, the more irrational the language used.

The first volume, *Your Speech Reveals your Personality*, tells of many forms of disturbed speechmaking, including stuttering, a complex ritual filled with symbolic acts of reticence. Although sometimes what is said comes couched in not-altogether-satisfactory generalizations, the concepts described are understandable and make good sense.

Language is a symbolizing process, which, says Barbara, is a "fundamental aspect of the whole personality." The problem of speech for many is to find and express in a unified pattern of word-symbols that which the author repeatedly calls the "truth" about the inner self, and "reality" of outside things and people. To this personal problem is added the difficulty of rendering such symbols comprehensible to others. But instead of meeting the needs of the inner self with courage, self-acceptance, and feelings unbound, people are apt to erupt verbally into grandiose attempts to fulfill all wants in what the author describes as the "Demosthenes Complex," or else, as he explains in succeeding chapters, retreat with self-effacing apologies, with defensive arrogance, or quiet resignation.

Disturbances in communication are basically distortions in transmission or distortions in perception—hence the second book on how not to jam the feedback. This work, *The Art of Listening*, is a hastily written but interesting treatment of a topic discussed briefly in the first. Listening, says the author, demands an ever-increasing awareness of ourselves and others. Not for the basically lazy, listening is done best by those who have shed fears and prejudices, and can gauge *what* is said (or *not said*), as well as *how* it is said, all with relaxed confidence, concentration, and insight.

These two volumes merit the close attention of anyone interested in speech. The writing is, however, often loose-jointed and repetitious, and one begs, at times, for lively illustration. The messages are sound—especially one basic thought: emotional good health could quench the dryness in us all.

KENNETH W. PAULI
Vanderbilt University

SHOP TALK

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor*

ON FOOTNOTES AND CITATIONS

Among the hazards of the academic profession is constant exposure to footnotes. Various occupational diseases may result. One is known as footnote-itis. Old ST was recently diagnosed as having this malady by a New York publisher, who wrote in the manuscript: "251 footnotes in 50 pages of text? Would this be footnote-itis?" This is not the place to describe the pathology of citations. Perhaps it is enough warning to say the diseases are highly communicable.

"The primary aim of a citation is to facilitate finding the item cited," says *A Uniform System of Citation* (The Harvard Law Review Association, 9th edition, 1955, foreword). This may be a satisfactory definition from the legal view, but it hardly covers the situation. Footnotes are made for a variety of reasons. There is the one-from-vanity, which recounts the author's achievements. A recent article is documented entirely from the author's previous works. Then there is the stuff-left-over citation, consisting of junk that couldn't be worked into the text. There is the elaborate-the-obvious citation; articles in speech journals and works frequently carry the note that Aristotle is to be found in 12 volumes, edited by W. D. Ross, published by Oxford at the Clarendon, that this particular work was translated by etc., etc., whereas a simple 1355^{b} would do the job, if by now we do not know where to find "Rhetoric may be defined as . . . ," whatever that may mean. There is the learned and useless citation, such as locating "To be, or not to be" on page so and so of volume XX of the forty volume complete works, Lower Sandusky, Ohio, such and such, so and so, page. (*Hamlet,* III, 1, 56 would be sufficient and helpful, if location of this chestnut "must give us pause"—*ibid.,* 68.) Several writers in the profession make a point of citing page of the first edition, 1776, George Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric,* with all the details of publication; a simple chapter and section reference would enable lesser folks who have only later editions available to locate the quotation if they wished.

All this is not to disparage a good, clean footnote. Often it is helpful to someone who wants to read further, and sometimes a footnote reveals information an author would not, for reasons of modesty or protection, put in the text. He may shyly reveal some possible imperfection in his method. Those generous credits made to others, to a wife, cousin, or graduate student, may indicate someone else did the work. (See J. E. Neale, *The Elizabethan House of Commons,* page 301, n.1: "The information and figures in this chapter are largely derived from four M.A. theses . . . written under my supervision.") Besides, one should always read the fine print before he signs. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, in their little booklet, *How To Read A Financial Statement* (available free at your brokers) say:

> Most people do not like to read footnotes because they distract from the main theme, are usually complicated, and almost always

in small hard-to-read type. However, footnotes are important in company reports and should be studied. Many companies point out: "The accompanying footnotes are an integral part of the financial statements."

An unidentified quotation can be exasperating or may lead to a pleasant search. In his *On Compromise*, John Morley, usually an impeccable scholar, gives as dedication a statement from Whately, "It makes all the difference in the world whether we put Truth in the first place or in the second place," but he does not cite it. Where shall one look? To footnote or not to footnote often is a question, but this is not to condone the laziness of those who paraphrase something they won't take time to locate, or hide under an "It has been said" allusion. Seeking a hard to find quotation can bring days of pleasure, and ease the conscience from the sins of not getting the article finished. *The New York Times Book Review* (June 28, 1959, p. 8) has a story about Louella D. Everett, who has made a career of locating quotations. On one occasion she answered every problem in a *Times* query section. "I know what it's like to have a haunt," she says. She has answered thousands of queries just for the fun of it, although she did help Christopher Morley put together two editions of *Bartlett*.

Some people have no scent for citations, and can sleep peacefully without any haunts. Others can't quite manage the system of footnoting. ST has a friend with a dozen papers unpublished because he can't bring himself to master the mysteries of *ibids.*, and *ids.*, and *loc. cits.* He speaks of "putting in his footnotes," as one would refer to "putting in gestures." In the natural method, the footnote settles gracefully to the bottom of the page, and classifies itself as *infra*, *Ex parte*, or *supra*. Of course, a good manual can facilitate the setting. It can be frustrating, however. Even if you study *The MLA Style Sheet*, or Kate Turabian's simplification of the University of Chicago's *A Manual of Style*, or the GPO *Style Manual*, you will come across an editor who has his own method. Editors seem to follow the advice Thomas Jefferson gave in his *Manual of Parliamentary Practice:* "Whether these forms be in all cases the most rational or not, is really not of so great importance. It is much more material that there should be a rule to go by, than what that rule is."[1]

CITATION—CASE STUDY. Back in 1953 we were trying to locate a quotation. Somewhere, sometime, evidently James A. Winans had said something resembling "A speech is not an essay on its hind legs." But what did he actually say, and when and where? After much searching, without results, we decided to appeal to the fountain itself. Then ensued a correspondence on the matter, and the thing was cleared up in two months. The only practical result was a learned footnote.[2] Winans was a punctilious and prolix letter writer; he not only answered promptly the matter at hand and to the point, but philosophized on the day's doings, and frequently offered rebuttal to some of the asides in the letter he received. He pecked out his letters on the typewriter, but he didn't trust his skill for the envelope, so did the address in a colossal longhand that took most of the envelope, barely leaving room for the stamp. He never bothered about a return address; it was always take it or leave it, with him. He loved folk expressions and illiterate spellings and pronunciations if they conveyed a particular meaning. What follows was private correspondence, not copy for the printer. On that he was perfectionist and individualist, and wouldn't take sass from any

[1] Sec. I. Although Thomas Jefferson is not the direct subject of this essay, it might be well to note, *in passim*, that Jefferson's personal copy of the *Manual*, 1801, with his glosses, has been located by this author, in a glass display case in the Library of Congress (information-left-over citation, with overtones of personal laudation).

[2] The citation as given in *QJS*, XLIV (April 1958), 119, reads: James A. Winans, "Aims and Standards in Public Speaking Work," *The English Journal*, XII (1923), 230-231.

printer or publisher; his first work and his last he had privately printed to his specifications (although he got along well enough with publishers in general).

We began by saying we had always heard the phrase attributed to him, but never had seen any source. "Max Parrish," we wrote, "says in his *Speaking in Public* (chapter 2), that a speech is not 'an essay standing on its hind legs.' He gives the phrase in quotations, but there is no documentation. When we asked him where he got it he replied, 'Probably from Winans; that's where I got most of my ideas.'" To this initial query Winans promptly replied September 9, 1953:

Dear Dick:

I am blushing deeply at having my poetic words brought into such glaring prominence. I meant glamorous.

I think the original phrase was "essay standing," but am not sure.

And I hope it is mine. I know I used it; but how can one know? Does one ever know where his expressions come from. Or his ideas? When I consider the labor I have been through to decide if I invented the notion involved in "a keen sense of communication," I wonder.

The expression you ask about seems just a little joke and I wasn't quite sure it was a good figger. But I was trying to say something striking against the notion some have that you can write a nice essay, stand up and say it and have a speech. English teachers often have that notion. Away back in 1904 when I became head of the dept. of Elocution and Oratory I hoped that old enmity between us and the English dept. might be smoothed up. So one day I dropped in to talk with Jimmy Hart (James Morgan Hart, head of English and writer of books on rhetoric, so-called). Jimmy allowed that there was something in our work; a man might take six weeks to learn to b-r-e-a-t-h-e. . . . But Jimmy had plenty of ideas and in his book he tells why oratory is not a branch of literature.

Well, I do not care whether it is a branch or not lit. at all; but a speech has to have some qualities not too common in literature. Clearness; that is clearness for the hearers. I have received a pamphlet from Dartmouth containing the President's speeches to the students at College openings. I ought to write him and tell him how much I like one quality: I believe I could have understood what he said as I sat in professorial dignity on the platform, and I believe the students could get him too. . . .

A speech should appeal to the interests of the hearers, and to their motives; and, in general, have directness in matter as well as in delivery. All this you know, but I am just trying to get at my own idea. Or what I think was my idea. Maybe it was the expression of a feeling and not based on analysis.

Of course, the qualities we wish in speeches are important in written matter too, though the relationship is vaguer between writer and reader. The reader can stop and consider; he does not have to keep pace with the writer. And essays are among the forms that have the least direct contact. If what I am saying now (no essay, I hope) is muddled, you can at least stop and guess out a meaning.

Now where I uttered those tricky words, I do not know. I have hunted several times through this four-room flat, and cannot find a box of magazines that should be here. Must be I have kindly and foolishly loaned them. I want them especially because Hal Harding is writing my obituary, and has smothered me with questions.

It might have been in a speech years ago to New York state teachers. That appeared in the *English Journal* along about 1917, fore and aft. More likely in a talk in the Nat'l Association. Or in the Eastern Conference. Maybe got into the *Pub. Speaking Review*. Those magazines are among the lost. Maybe I shall get the gumption to paw over the Q.J's. Maybe, but gumption is not strong in me. Or I am short on it. Maybe you will do the pawing.

Several weeks later we wrote telling him that "A speech is not merely an essay standing on its hind legs," appears in *A First Course in Public Speaking* by James Albert Winans and Hoyt Hopewell Hudson (New York and London, The Century Co., 1930), page 17. Winans replied post haste, on October 1:

Dear Dick:

Quite a feat. I am glad the fatal words are spotted. I did some looking, but never thought of that book.

But 'spotted' is the word. Who did them? Hudson or Winans? Hoyt wrote that book, drawing largely from me in parts and much less in parts. We conferred

through one summer, or part of it. (He took too much in the latter part of the book, for a high school book.)

I am still at sea. If I sit down and think real hard I can imagine that I wrote those words on the margin of Hoyt's manuscript or proof. But that may be pure fancy. I can equally imagine us sitting in an office at Dartmouth and I spoke the *freighted* words. We did that sort of thing, with feet elevated. I seem a little more firmly to recall that there was some question as to their appropriateness in a school book; that I did the questioning and Hoyt was for them. But that was all back in the late twenties. He may have said 'em and I may have said 'em.

As I said before I think I uttered those words somewhere. But maybe in inspired extemp. talk in a convention, one of those glittering offhand gems we have had all nicely canned in advance. Still such a truth does not need pounding in our conventions. I think they would have been better in a teachers meeting, English teachers, at Syracuse, but *English Journal* has disappeared. I find that Hoyt wrote me compliments on the article, May 21, 1923. But that seems too late. Maybe another article.

If I could find the proof MSS of that *First Course*, I might find the words on the edge; but I doubt if I have the proofs now; and have a bad cold and so less gumption than usual.

Possibly Parrish knows something about his source. Maybe you will just have to say, In words ascribed to. . . .

Later

I looked up my old file for Hudson. I found many good letters from Hoyt and Margaret, and several about the book; but nothing on the early chapters. My notion is that we did talk about the phrase, and he overrode my doubts. But that settles nothing.

Yours sincerely,
J. A. Winans

It was five weeks before we got around to trying the *English Journal*—letter from Hudson clue, but when we did, it was no trouble "spotting" the elusive quotation. What Winans said originally was, "Where in the world is there a place for a thing neither speech nor essay, but a composition standing on its hind legs?" It is from a paper read at a joint meeting of the Speech and English sections at the New York State Teachers Association, held in Syracuse, November 29, 1922. This we duly reported. Back came this reply:

Dear Dick:

You, being young and full of pep, do not know the real meaning of shiftlessness. I have had rare training for it. I stopped teaching at 73. The great point of retirement is the privilege of jeering at the clock. That I did boldly, but I still thought I would work—some. At 75 I had a coronary, six weeks flat on my back; and left the hospital with strong admonitions to do nothing. I thought a year would finish me, in spite of the nice words of the doctor. All that was very flattening. The habits of a lifetime fade away. Now a job makes me think of good reasons for doing something else of a lighter natur, such as reading the paper, or getting something to eat. Now I like to write letters, once I get started right; but I hate to begin. Just shiftless. Of course some one might murmur about my age. Also I might mention a new adventure of mine, starting September 27. A light cold which would not quit. Doctor gave me penicillin, his pet remedy. Ten days later he opined that I had had Walking Pneumonia. I knew about pneumonia, but he said that was out of fashion. A virus. I knew about virus pneu., but I did not know it walked. He was right when he said, "It takes a lot out of you." I am still bum, but emerging.

The above spiel is part of my shiftlessness. A way of avoiding the real business of this letter. You have really got the pig by the tail. (Old age brings back the charming language of my childhood.) I just had a vague notion that Syracuse was the place. But how the devil did I get there in 1922? I left Cornell in '20. But that fall I was loafing in Columbia U. No idea of who invited me or how I got there, though I remember a few facts about the convention. I remember nothing about the reactions to my paper except that a well known teacher in the Rochester schools, who had written a very successful textbook, was right down in front and he chuckled a lot.

Well, you have up and done it. And you say the job was rewarding. I hope so, but

while my idea is good I am not too sure I put it quite right. And not quite sure my figger is good. But let 'er ride. I am too shiftless to labor over what you chaps think is a gem.

I do not just get your statement that an essay on its hind legs isn't a bad description of a speech. Noah Webster does not help me; but an essay is a thing you read, all by your lonesome, sitting before the fireplace. It's in the *Atlantic Monthly* maybe. The writer has little regard for the reader he does not know. He pours out his soul, if any, with some hope that somebody will respond; but that is a rather vague notion, and often that thought does not control his pen. Sometimes a thing called an essay does have great directness, but then it is hardly an essay. I used to read Lyman Abbott's papers in *The Outlook*. (You remember the old *Outlook*.) Maybe called essays; but I could always see the old warrior holding forth from pulpit or platform. He was preaching, or lecturing. (But I do not like that word 'lecturing.' Too often lectures, especially the thing we call lectures in college, are just impersonal essays actuating impersonal pencils, or snores.)

Well, quite a spiel. . . .

It was five years before we got around to writing up the paper we needed the citation for, and by that time Winans had been dead for two years; so he didn't see the gem properly cited. Perhaps it is just as well we didn't get the thing finished in his lifetime; Winans never did care much for footnotes.

NOTICE
CONTRIBUTORS TO *QJS*

A new Editor and Editorial Board take office on January 1, 1960, and become responsible for the *Journal* with the issue of February 1960. The names of the members of the new Editorial Board will be announced in Forum for December. In the meantime, *and effective at once*, persons wishing to submit manuscripts should send them to Professor Richard Murphy, Editor-Elect, *QJS*, 204A Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

DONALD C. BRYANT
Editor

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

NATIONAL

Speech Association of America: Statler, Washington, December 28-30; (1960, The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30; 1961, New York; 1962, Cleveland; 1963 [August], Denver).

American Educational Theatre Association: with SAA in Washington; (1960, University of Denver, August 28-30; 1961, Waldorf-Astoria, New York, August 28-30; 1962, University of Minnesota, August 24-26; 1963, University of Oregon, August 26-28; 1964, University of Pittsburgh, August 27-29).

American Speech and Hearing Association: Statler, Cleveland, November 11-14; (1960, Statler, Los Angeles, November).

REGIONAL

Central States: La Salle Hotel, Chicago, April 8-9.

Eastern States: Henry Hudson Hotel, New York, April 7-9.

New England States: Statler, Boston, November 27-28.

Southern States: Hotel Robert E. Lee, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, April 3-8.

Western States: Rickey's, Palo Alto, California, November 26-28.

RELATED ORGANIZATIONS

American Association for Cleft Palate Rehabilitation: Brown Palace Hotel, Denver, May 12-14.

Modern Language Association: Palmer House, Chicago, December 27-29.

National Council of Teachers of English: Cosmopolitan Hotel, Denver, November 26-28.

INTERNATIONAL DEBATE. Selection of debaters to tour the British Isles in January and February was made at Evanston in June. Ten debaters, finalists from the entire country, attended the trials. Selected are Harold Allen Hovey, a graduate of Wabash College, who did a year's graduate work at Harvard, and now is studying government at Georgetown University, and Raymond Lindley Nichols, a senior at the University of Kansas. Alternates selected are Joel Davidow of Princeton University and Donald Franchot McHenry of Southern Illinois University. The tour will be sponsored by SAA, the Institute of International Education, and the English-Speaking Union.

University of Cambridge Union debaters are touring eastern colleges this fall. They are Julian Grenfell of Eton and King's and Roger Warren Evans of Leighton Park School and Trinity. Both have served as president of the Union. Some of the topics suggested are: Communism's strongest ally is the stupidity of the West; The American high school is the grave of American greatness; This house regrets the American way of life; Commander Whitehead does not adequately represent the English way of life.

Inquiries should be sent to David B. Wodlinger, Director, European Department, Institute of International Education, 1 East 67th Street, New York 21.

DISCUSSION BY TAPE. Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois Undergraduate Division, Navy Pier, Chicago, has announced the Ninth Annual Contest in Public Discussion. Any collegiate institution may participate by sending a taped discussion on the national question.

The award last year went to Fresno State College. A copy of the discussion can be had by sending a tape and a dollar to the DAVI National Tape Repository, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Since the December issue will be the present editor's last, from now on please send news and notes to the new Shop Talk editor, Robert L. Scott, Department of Speech, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

INTERCOLLEGIATE QUESTIONS. The SAA Committee on Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate on August 7 announced the topics for 1959-60. The national debate proposition is, Resolved: *That Congress should be given the power to reverse decisions of the Supreme Court.* The national discussion question is, *What should be the role of government in regulating organized labor?* Orville Hitchcock, State University of Iowa, is chairman of the committee.

The high school questions were reported in detail, April issue, page 232.

THE GOLDEN SAES CONVENTION. Feeling that the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the oldest speech association in the country was not something to be left to a deputy, ST hopped the Twentieth Century out of Chicago and reported bright and early the morning of Thursday, April 9, at the Henry Hudson Hotel in New York. Putting on his most congenial manner he roamed the registration quarters without seeing a soul he knew. This was not so surprising, since the last Eastern convention he attended was in 1935. He soon discovered the off-corridor retreat of his faithful correspondent, Wiley Bowyer, secretary, and from then on things picked up.

It was a big convention, with about 1500 total attendance. In recognition of the occasion, many old timers, some now far beyond the region, returned. The feature program was a general session reviewing the history of the association. Fifteen past presidents gave what were billed as short statements in retrospect. Jane Dorsey Zimmerman, president 1936-1937, recalled the simple days, when the group flourished without constitution and by-laws, and all those committees. "Twelve pages of committees and committee meetings," she tabulated; "soon we won't have any room for a program." (The convention, however, seemed not at all abashed by creeping institutionalism, and in later sessions debated constitutional revisions in good spirit.) The feature of the feature program was Drew Pearson, speaking about his father, Paul M. Pearson, who founded the organization back in 1909 at a meeting at Swarthmore College.

The Washington columnist talked delightfully for about forty-five minutes. He declaimed some of the inspirational poems his father had used on the Chautauqua circuit. He recalled that his father used to practice his vowels while calling his daughter: "Bar-bah-rah." He described his father's later years, after he returned from being governor of the Virgin Islands and lobbied for public housing. Out in California he worked on a housing bill: "He camped in the lobbies of the legislature until that bill was passed." Here there was a pause. "And the day it was passed. . . ." Drew Pearson wove a bit from side to side, shuffled his papers, then tucked them in his portfolio, and sat down in tears. The audience, realizing the ellipsis could have been completed with the words, "he died," rose to a man, and applauded. ST was so carried away he neglected to pull out his stop watch to time the ovation. Magdalene Kramer, prexy, in the chair, remained calm and handled the dramatic episode skillfully by making no reference to it in her closing remarks. The next day she was awarded a gavel in recognition of her services to SAES, also went into tears, but sustained the verbal along with the lachrymal

flow. Later, in reporting some of these moving incidents to a group of bookmen assembled at displays in the lobby, ST got the cynical retort, "Very clutchy, fifty years of speech." Well, it was.

Available for distribution at the convention was *A History of the Speech Association of the Eastern States*, an eighteen page publication written by Herbert A. Wichelns. A second publication, *Re-Establishing the Speech Profession: The First Fifty Years*, edited by Robert T. Oliver and Marvin G. Bauer, was announced at the convention, and is now in print. Copies of these publications can be had from Wiley C. Bowyer, Executive-Secretary, Speech Association of the Eastern States, Mineola Public Schools, Mineola, New York. Price of the history is a dollar, and the second publication is $1.50.

BOOK AUCTION

Shop Talk has received a number of inquiries about locating hard to find books. The items listed below are those most frequently mentioned. With zeal and serendipity, we have assembled one copy of each, which will go to the highest bidder. Please enclose bid with name on an inner plain envelope. We reserve the right to refuse to sell below cost, and to announce the highest bidder. Profits will be contributed to SAA. Auction closes November 15.

A History and Criticism of American Public Address. Edited by William Norwood Brigance. First edition, second impression, 1943. Originally sold at $10.00 for the two volumes. Good, clean set.

Chauncey A. Goodrich. *Select British Eloquence*. An early reprinting, 1853, of the 1852 first edition. Hinges loose.

The Rhetorical Idiom. Edited by Donald C. Bryant. Published in 1958, at $6.00, it went out of print in eight months.

The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIV (February, 1958). Very rare. Because of a surge in renewals and new memberships, the mailing room was caught short seventy copies.

We are happy to announce that another much sought item, *History of Speech Education in America*, edited by Karl R. Wallace, was reprinted in September by the original publishers, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., at $8.50.

ALUMNI APPEAL. American Alumni Council, Washington, D.C., has prepared a special sixteen page supplement on college teaching for use by college alumni magazines. The Council hopes to have the section included in 249 journals, with a circulation of over 2,000,000 copies. The illustrated supplement pictures the joys and woes of college teachers and makes an appeal to alumni for more support. *The Alumni News*, Kansas State Teachers College, ran the supplement as a special edition in May. The front cover is a picture of George R. R. Pflaum and two students, and the dedication inside the cover says: "Professor Pflaum, who recently completed 35 years of teaching [speech] at Emporia State Teachers College, is representative of the many dedicated faculty on the campus."

STUDENT APPEAL. Last year SAA had a special undergraduate student membership rate of $2.50, provided ten or more subscriptions were sent in at one time. Forty schools took advantage of the offer. Owen Peterson, SAA executive secretary, announces the offer is being repeated this year.

SERENDIPITY. A graduate student stopped by the office the other day to relate an experience. He is working on James E. Murdoch, and, during a vacation trip East, searched various bookstores in Boston, New York, and other places for a copy of *Analytic Elocution*, 1884, but without any luck. Coming home he was delayed by minor motor trouble in Cincinnati, and in his timekilling walk drifted into Acres of Books. There, in a throw-away bin at ten cents was his copy, mint condition.

This recalled an incident ST had with a student some years ago. The student wanted to start out his thesis with a quotation from Joseph Conrad, "Give me the right word and the right accent, and I will move the world." He had come across the statement in a book of quotations, and that is all he knew about it. ST ruled a thesis couldn't properly be started from *Bartlett*, although he might be tucked in somewhere in an appendix. The student was determined, and spent a week trying to locate the quotation in Conrad. Saturday night, after the library closed, weary and worn, considering changing his thesis subject to Conrad, he stopped at a campus spot and sat opposite an equally worn fellow student. In the conversation it developed the second student was doing a study of Conrad, and quickly identified the quotation as from "A Familiar Preface," *A Personal Record*. There

was line one, footnote one, all assembled, and with this problem out of the way student one had no problem at all polishing off his thesis.

CALL FOR CONVENTION

The 43rd annual convention of the Speech Association of America and affiliated groups will be held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C. Regular program sections are scheduled from Monday, December 28 through Wednesday, December 30. Preliminary meetings of committees and interest groups will be held Sunday, December 27.

The program is being arranged by Kenneth G. Hance, First Vice-President of SAA, in cooperation with the vice-chairmen of SAA interest groups, and sponsors of cooperating organizations.

NEW ASSOCIATION. A group of people in the New York area, interested in speech and hearing problems, have founded The American Psychological Speech and Hearing Association. The group meets periodically, with some open meetings and some closed seminars. Information can be had from the secretary, Franklyn Elliott, 110 Francis Lewis Boulevard, Hollis, New York.

REVEREND FRANCIS P. DONNELLY, S.J., 1869-1959

Father Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., one of the foremost Jesuit teachers, lecturers, writers, and educators in America during the first half of this century, died at the Jesuit House of Studies, St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., on April 18, 1959, at the age of eighty-nine. To teachers and students of speech, Father Donnelly is perhaps best known for his excellent and scholarly treatise on rhetoric, *Persuasive Speech*, and for his critical appreciations and analyses of Cicero's *Manilian Law* and *Milo* speeches and Demosthenes' *On the Crown*.

Francis P. Donnelly was born at Pittston, Pennsylvania, December 10, 1869. His early studies were at St. John's Academy in Pittston and at Villanova Preparatory School. He entered Fordham College in New York City in 1885, and remained there until he entered the Society of Jesus at the old novitiate in Frederick, Maryland, in 1888. While at Villanova and Fordham, he was a classmate and close friend of the popular poet T. A. Daly, who attributed to Father Donnelly's early inspiration and encouragement his own career as a writer. Father Donnelly did his theological studies at Woodstock College, Maryland, where he was ordained a priest by James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, in 1903. During his many years as a teacher and lecturer, Father Donnelly was professor of rhetoric at Boston College, Holy Cross College, the Jesuit House of Studies at Poughkeepsie, and at Fordham University, where he taught from 1929 until his retirement in 1952, when he returned to Poughkeepsie and remained until his death. He was the recipient of honorary Litt. D. degrees from Holy Cross College (1929), Fordham University (1934), and Georgetown University (1938).

In his teaching and writings, Father Donnelly may be considered to have been a living example of the pedagogical principles embodied in the Jesuit system of education, the *Ratio Studiorum*. His *Model English*, which was published in 1902 (Volume I) and in 1919 (Volume II), went through many editions, and has been used in many secondary schools and colleges throughout the country as a text for study and writing in the English language. This work extensively exemplifies the classical principle of "imitation." Besides some twenty devotional books, Father Donnelly is also known for his books on education and literature, such as *Principles of Jesuit Education* (1934), *The Art of Interesting* (1920), *Art Principles in Literature* (1923), *Literary Art and Modern Education* (1927), and *Literature the Leading Educator* (1938).

Father Donnelly's death was mourned by a large number of devoted students, now in various professions, many of whom paid glowing and sincere tribute to their former professor as one of the most inspiring and stimulating teachers they ever had. The Rev. Robert I. Gannon, S.J., one of Father Donnelly's students at the Jesuit House of Studies in Poughkeepsie, and later President of Fordham University for 13 of the 23 years Father Donnelly taught there, asked for a comment for this memorial, had this to say:

> We called him "old man variety" when I was in his class of rhetoric forty years ago. He never seemed to use a method twice, and in reviewing matter had so many fresh approaches that his students never lost a sense of adventure. He could write a speech in journalese with the youngest of them, but never ceased to be an uncompromising conservative in the best sense of "conservare," which means to gather to-

gether and preserve. He thought young orators had something to learn from Cardinal Newman and Winston Churchill, to say nothing of Cicero, and advocated the moulding of youthful style by an imitation of the world's best models. He could recognize eternal values in any century, and was convinced that in times of flux like ours, an educator's principal duty was to sort out and hand on the gold of past and present generations in the wistful hope that culture might survive. No one has quite taken his place.

Rev. W. K. Trivett, S.J.
Fordham University
College of Philosophy and Letters
Shrub Oak, New York

Vance Mulock Morton, 1892-1959

Vance Morton, Brooklyn College, died April 19, 1959, of a heart attack. He was born March 19, 1892, in Iowa City, Iowa. He atended college in his home town, and received from the State University of Iowa a B.A. and an M.A. degree. For three years after graduation he taught at the university, 1921-1924. He then went to the University of Missouri, where he taught speech, 1924-1925. For the next two years, 1925-27, he taught at Northwestern University. He then returned to his alma mater, where he was on the speech and dramatic art staff until 1946. That year he went to Brooklyn College.

Immediately upon his coming to Brooklyn, Professor Morton assumed a major role in the affairs of the Department of Speech and Theatre. His prestige strengthened the department in general, and his experience and insight were particularly useful in the areas of theatre and the required speech courses. Always preferring teaching to administration, he nevertheless willingly served on numerous department and college committees and became coordinator of the required courses in speech, chairman of the theatre committee, deputy chairman in the summer session, and deputy chairman of the department in the regular session.

A pioneer in educational theatre, he bore witness to the importance of theatre in a liberal arts program. A specialist in the history of the American theatre and a director of over one hundred and fifty plays, he was above all a magnificent teacher. To him a student was a particular human being to be listened to and understood. Under the patient, kind, yet not indulgent, tutelage of Vance Morton, a student came to know his own creative powers.

Vance Morton was a selfless man, committed to the highest standards of personal conduct and academic worth. He was gentle and friendly. His was a gracious as well as productive life.

Orvin Larson
Brooklyn College

Notes and Queries

James Kimsey, Northwest Christian College, Eugene, Oregon, is making a study of the "Warrack Lectures on Preaching," and is trying to locate printed copies of the lectures and persons who may have knowledge of them. The lectures were begun in 1921, and are alternated among four Scottish universities: Glasgow, Aberdeen, Edinburgh, and St. Andrews. The lectures were not printed consistently by any publisher. Seven of them, 1913, 1949, 1950-1952, 1954, 1956, are in print and have been procured. The others are a mystery, Mr. Kimsey reports.

W. M. P. wants to know the origin of an old story, sometimes referred to as the world's worst debate case. He says he has used it for years, but the source is beginning to haunt him. It seems a man once borrowed a pitcher from a neighbor, and was accused of returning it in damaged condition. The defense was: first, the pitcher was perfectly sound when he returned it; second, the pitcher was already cracked when he borrowed it; third, he had never borrowed it anyway. W. M. P. thinks the origin may be classical.

Robert W. Smith, Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas, notes that with all this interest in Russia, with our and their dignitaries exchanging visits, readers might care to receive samples of Soviet rhetoric. He suggests persons interested should write to: Press Department, Embassy of the USSR, 1706 18th Street, NW, Washington 9, D. C., and ask to be put on the mailing list for speeches.

H. L. M. wants to know the source of the jingle that runs:

The centipede was happy quite
Until a toad in fun
Said "Pray, which leg goes after which?"
That worked her mind to such a pitch
She lay distracted in a ditch
Considering how to run.

He says the bit is much quoted in connection

with the virtues of the natural method in voice and gesture, but he has never seen a source. There are variations.

SUMMER WORKSHOPS AND INSTITUTES

The Adelphi Summer Theatre Workshop featured visiting professional actors: Richard Clemo in *The Man Who Came to Dinner;* John McQuade in *An Inspector Calls;* Michael Clarke-Laurence and Jane Rose in *Blithe Spirit;* Louise Platt in *A Streetcar Named Desire.* Ruth St. Denis was a special lecturer at the workshop. Members attended *All's Well that Ends Well* at the Shakespeare Festival in Stratford, Connecticut. Adelphi College held a practicum in methods of aiding the speech and hearing handicapped, with various guest lecturers.

Thomas A. Rousse, University of Texas, Harold Weiss, Southern Methodist University, and Elton Abernathy, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, were lecturers at the Baylor University Summer Teachers Workshop and High School Speech Institute.

William R. Leith directed Colorado State University's first summer Workshop in Speech Correction.

Florida State University, after a lapse of two years, revived its Southeastern Summer High School Speech Institute. Arthur H. Dorlag supervised dramatics; Gregg Phifer was in charge of forensics.

A high school speech and theatre institute was held at Indiana University, July 12-25. Eugene K. Bristow was director. Visiting members of the staff were Mrs. Juanita Shearer, Brazil High School and state director of the Thespian Society, and Arthur F. Fleser, director of forensics at Columbus High School. The forensics division closed with a public debate and a televised debate on propositions drawn from the 1959-60 national high school debate question. The dramatics division concluded with two performances of a bill including *The Proposal, Fumed Oak,* and *The House of Bernarda Alba.* A workshop in speech correction, open only to June high school graduates, was held at Indiana University, July 12-25, under the direction of Robert Milisen. Scholarships for the workshop were provided by the Psi Iota Xi sorority and the Indiana University Foundation.

At Kent State University, James N. Holm directed the twenty-fourth annual High School Speech Institute. One of the final projects was an abbreviated version of *Midsummer Night's Dream.* The Speech and Hearing Clinic conducted its fourteenth annual Summer Children's Clinic in reeducation and therapy for children and parents.

The Twenty-Fifth Annual Conference on Speech Education was held at Louisiana State University, June 9-18. This year the visiting lecturer was Marie Hochmuth, University of Illinois. She gave eight lectures, on general topics such as "Rhetoric as a Humane Study" and specific studies such as "George Bernard Shaw, Rhetorician and Speaker."

Mississippi Southern College conducted a High School Workshop and Institute for teachers from July 25 through August 8.

The Speech and Hearing Center at Montclair State College was in session from June 29 to August 7. Fifty-three children were enrolled in an intensive program of speech therapy.

Northern Illinois University operated its speech and hearing center this summer in cooperation with the Illinois Division of Services for Crippled Children.

Special features of Northwestern University's summer program were: a Symposium on Contemporary Issues in Speech Education; a Symposium on the Issues of Broadcasting; and a Television Internship program in cooperation with WNBO, National Broadcasting Company, and WTTW, Chicago's educational television station. Among the guest lecturers for the series on Issues in Speech Education were John Dietrich, Karl F. Robinson, Marcella Oberle, J. Jeffery Auer, Gladys Borchers, Ralph McGee, Albert Becker, Wanda Mitchell, and Ralph Nichols. Guest lecturers on Issues of Broadcasting included Honorable John C. Doerfer, chairman, FCC, Eric Barnouw of Columbia University, Gilbert Seldes, Hugh M. Beville, Jr., Vice President at NBC, John O'Brien of the Voice of America, Reuel Denney of the University of Chicago, Richard Guylay, director of public relations for the Republican National Committee, and Samuel E. Brightman, Public Affairs Committee of the Democratic National Committee.

Purdue University conducted a pre-college institute in speech pathology and audiology during July, under a grant from Psi Iota Xi. Twenty-four outstanding high school girls attended a one-week program designed to acquaint them with the needs and possibilities of the profession. In June, Betty Ann Wilson directed a workshop in remedial speech and hearing, designed for teachers and public school nurses. Two other Purdue workshops in drama were offered for high school teachers

and students. *Cry Havoc*, produced and performed by workshop members, climaxed the drama institutes.

At St. Louis University, twenty high school teachers explored the uses of audio visual aids to facilitate instruction in speech. Further experiments are planned for the coming year.

Stanford University held its seventeenth annual Radio and Television Institute, in cooperation with NBC, CBS, and educational television station KQED. George Willey is the new director of the institute.

Teachers College, Columbia University, held a workshop in community theatre under the direction of Robert Leppert, Paterson State College. A six-weeks workshop in stagecraft was also offered.

Sixty-six high school students and twenty-two high school teachers of speech and drama attended the twenty-eighth annual Workshop in Speech and Dramatic Art at the State University of Iowa from June 22 through July 17. Hugh F. Seabury was in charge.

At the University of Florida, the sixth annual English Language Institute was held in July and August, under the direction of C. K. Thomas. Because of the absence of Cubans, the enrollment was somewhat smaller than in previous years. The sixth annual speech and hearing conference was held on June 9-11. Guest speaker and consultant was Mildred Berry of Rockford College.

The sixteenth annual Residential Center for handicapped children was held at the University of Illinois this summer. E. Thayer Curry and James Kelly directed. The ninth Summer Youth Theatre for high school students was directed by Charles H. Shattuck and Webster Smalley. The production was scenes from plays by Jean Giraudoux. The eighth Summer Debaters Workshop for high school students was directed by King Broadrick and Wayne Brockriede. Under auspices of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, members of the speech staff, Wayne Brockriede, Theodore Clevenger, Halbert Gulley, and Richard Murphy, taught classes in speech and parliamentary procedure for labor groups meeting on the campus in short courses. It was the thirteenth summer for United Steelworkers of America courses.

In order to acquaint students with various areas of research in speech, the following spoke at several University of Michigan colloquia held during the summer session: Gordon E. Peterson, University of Michigan, "Aims and Procedures in Research;" Eugene Bahn, Wayne State University, "Opportunities for Research in Oral Interpretation;" Wilbur E. Moore, Central Michigan University, "The Contribution of Speech Rehabilitation to Language and Thought;" Stanley E. Seashore, University of Michigan, "Communications in Formal Organizations;" Ryland Crary, University of Pittsburgh, "Latest Trends in Television Research;" Hubert C. Heffner, Indiana University, "Why Research in Theatre and Drama?"

On July 9, the University of Michigan held its Summer Speech Conference on the theme, Speech Education—Today and Tomorrow. Speakers included: John Wray Young, president, American Educational Theater Association; William Harley, president, National Association of Education Broadcasters; Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University; Grant Fairbanks, University of Illinois; John E. Dietrich, president of SAA; Kenneth O. Johnson, executive secretary, American Speech and Hearing Association; Donald K. Smith, president, Central States Speech Association; Robert C. Bilger, University of Michigan.

Lee Strasberg of the Actors Studio, New York, conducted an acting workshop the first week of the summer session at the University of Minnesota. The Summer High School Workshop produced "Skin of our Teeth."

Forty-three were enrolled in the sixth annual High School Institute in Speech at the University of South Dakota. Featured were public programs in interpretation and drama, a television program over KVTV in Sioux City, Iowa, and a discussion panel on KELO-TV in Sioux Falls.

The University of Southern California held an International Seminar on Broadcasting, sponsored by the U. S. Department of State. Representatives from seventeen nations participated. From June 27 to October 24, the visitors studied and traveled under individual plans coordinated by Robert E. Summers. Franklin Dunham, chief of radio-television in the U. S. Office of Education, was visiting professor of Telecommunications at the University of Southern California during the summer. He presented a workshop in educational broadcasting and an advanced course in foreign systems of broadcasting.

The University of Southern California's sixth annual Theatre Workshop for High School Students was directed by Harold Salisbury of Los Angeles City College. The workshop culminated in six one-act plays, including the Lewis

John Carlino original, "Moment of Glass." Edward Borgers conducted the University's third annual Workshop in Radio-Television for High School Students. Southern California's third annual Western Forensic Institute, directed by James H. McBath, included on its staff Grace Walsh of Eau Claire State College, Wisconsin, Milton Dobkin of Humboldt State College, and Leland Roloff of Glendale Hoover High School.

RETIREMENTS

Agnes E. Futterer, New York State College for Teachers, Albany, retired in July. She served on the faculty forty-two years, and directed the work in theatre and interpretation, the main fields of her interest. Address: 18 Willett Street, Albany, New York.

Howard T. Hill, Kansas State University, Manhattan, retired in June. He was head of the department from 1922 to 1954.

F. Lincoln D. Holmes, Illinois State Normal University, retired September 1. He was head of the department of speech during his twenty-four years on the faculty. He taught at the University of Minnesota 1925-27 and 1928-32, at Lawrence College 1933-1934, and the University of Wisconsin 1934-1935. His main interest is in voice.

Professor Holmes has built a new home in Arizona, where he is now living, and plans to teach and write as opportunity arises. Address: 1301 West Vista Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona.

Everett L. Hunt (*QJS* editor, 1927-1929, and books editor, 1921-1923), Professor of English Literature at Swarthmore College, retired June 1. On May 16, he was married to Miss Marjorie Kate Watson of Swarthmore, who has a voice studio in Philadelphia.

Professor Hunt began his college teaching at his alma mater, Huron College, South Dakota, in 1913. From 1918 to 1925 he taught at Cornell University. Many of his years at Swarthmore were spent as dean. Three years ago he retired from administration and returned to teaching. He does not plan further administration or teaching, but hopes to "read, write, speak, sing, and ride horseback." His academic interests are in rhetoric in general and seventeenth century English literature.

At the SAA Christmas convention in Washington, D. C., personal tributes will be paid to Mr. Hunt at the Cornell lunch, and a section meeting of scholarly papers in his honor will be held. Address: 221 North Princeton Avenue, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.

R. C. Hunter, chairman of the speech department, Ohio Wesleyan University, retired in June, after thirty-nine years on the faculty. He taught at the Grosse Point School and at the Arthur Hill School in Saginaw, Michigan, before joining the Wesleyan staff in 1920. He taught four summers at the University of Michigan, six at Albion, and one at the University of Pittsburgh. His interests are mainly in drama and interpretation, especially Shakespearean.

Professor Hunter plans to improve his leisure time, but has no specific plans. Address: 93 Mason Avenue, Delaware, Ohio.

Charles F. Lindsley, Occidental College, Los Angeles, retired in June. He was a founder of the speech department, in 1923, and served on the faculty for thirty-five years. Among his many offices were those of chairman of the speech department and dean of the faculty.

Professor Lindsley is now in Ankara, Turkey, where he is director of the Georgetown University English Language program, sponsored by the Turkish government and the U. S. International Cooperation Administration.

Fred S. Sorrenson, Illinois State Normal University, retired September 1. He was on the faculty thirty-nine years. He began his college teaching at Mt. Morris College, Illinois, in 1912. From 1916 to 1919 he taught at Midland College, Fremont, Nebraska. His main interest is in interpretation. He is a charter member of the Illinois Speech Association.

He plans to retain his home in Normal, his summer place in Michigan, and is looking for a winter retreat in Florida. He says he will "continue to live in imagination with some of the greatest writers of all time." Address: 612 North School Street, Normal, Illinois.

WITH THE EMERITI. Claude M. Wise (*QJS* editor, 1936-1938), who retired from Louisiana State University in May 1958, has been appointed to teach English in five Hong Kong colleges, under the Smith Mundt Foundation. The past summer he taught at the University of Denver.

Professor Wise began his college teaching at his alma mater, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville, in 1914, where he served thirteen years before going to Louisiana

State University in 1928. On leave from L.S.U., he taught at the University of Missouri, 1946-1947, and the University of Hawaii, 1949-1950 and 1952-1953. He has lectured and given short courses at a number of universities.

Mr. Wise feels that his age of retirement, seventy, was about right for beginning a second career.

SUMMER THEATRE

Eastern Michigan University: *Arms and the Man.*

Georgetown College: *Happy Journey,* for children, with a cast of college students; *Pinocchio; Blue Overalls Angels,* with a cast of children. This was Georgetown's first summer theatre program.

Howard College: *Birthday in Venice.*

Indiana University: At the Brown County Playhouse, Nashville, Indiana: *Visit to a Small Planet, On Borrowed Time, The Rainmaker.* A special production in the University Theatre on campus of two experimental plays by Ionesco: *The Lesson, The Bald Soprano.*

Kansas State Teachers College: *Who Was that Lady I Saw You With, Angel Street, The Chalk Garden, All My Sons, Stalag 17, The Man Who Came to Dinner.*

Kansas State University: *Mrs. McThing.*

Kent State University: *Visit to a Small Planet.*

Mississippi Southern College: *The Tender Trap, The Kids, Gigi, Dracula, The Glass Menagerie, See How They Run, Picnic.*

New York State College for Teachers, Albany: Arena: *Too True to be Good, The House of Bernarda Alba, Uncle Vanya.*

Northwestern University: In its outdoor theatre, the Northwestern Drama Festival presented four plays rotating in repertory, with a different play given each night over a period of five weeks. The four plays were: *Oedipus, King of Thebes; The Rivals; Midsummer Night's Dream; Saint Joan.*

Purdue University: *Light up the Sky, Voice of the Turtle.*

San Fernando Valley State College: *The Snow Queen and the Goblin, The Land of the Dragon, Snow White and Rose Red, Ozma of Oz.* Casts consisted of teenagers from junior and senior high schools.

Stanford University: *Well of the Saints.*

State University of Iowa: *The Trial of Captain John Brown; The Gardener's Dog; The Seventh Farce; Tiger at the Gates; Western Child,* a new three act opera by Philip Bezanson, libretto by Paul Engle, part of the 21st Annual Fine Arts Festival of the University.

Teachers College, Columbia University: *Benten the Thief,* by Earle Ernst, an adaptation from a Japanese Kabuki play.

University of Connecticut: *The Desperate Hours, Sabrina Fair, Anniversary Waltz, Mr. Roberts, Monique, The Time of the Cuckoo.*

University of Florida: *Bus Stop.*

University of Hawaii: *Rumpelstiltskin, The Sleeping Beauty.*

University of Houston: *Scarecrow, The Match Maker.*

University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division: *The Barretts of Wimpole Street.*

University of Illinois: *A Trip Abroad* by Eugene Labiche and Edouard Martin; *The Cave Dwellers; Puss in Boots,* children's theatre production directed by Dorothy Kester, Akron Public Schools, visiting summer director.

University of Michigan: *The Boyfriend, Look Back In Anger, The Rivals, Waltz of the Toreadors, Rigoletto.*

University of Minnesota: *Pal Joey, A Stitch in Time, Billy the Kid* (a melodrama), and *She Stoops to Conquer* were shown throughout the summer on the Minnesota Centennial Showboat commanded by "Captain" Frank M. Whiting.

University of South Dakota: *Jennie Kissed Me, The Silver Whistle, Wonderful Town, Inherit the Wind, Amphitryon 38, Harvey, The Legend of Devil's Gulch.*

University of Southern California: *Dark Harvest,* a world premiere.

University of Virginia: *The Tender Trap, Dead on Nine, Nude With Violin.*

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY. This account of how Cornell University Theatre celebrated its fiftieth anniversary was prepared by Harriet Ann Ruch, University Theatre secretary:

The Cornell Dramatic Club celebrated its Fiftieth Anniversary during the 1958-59 season. The celebration was highlighted during the month of March with a production of Ibsen's *Ghosts* and a banquet for Club members and friends both past and present. The banquet featured two speakers who had been associated with the Club at different times, Dr. Smiley Blanton and Sidney Kingsley. Dr. Blanton was on the instruction staff at Cornell when the Club was founded and he served as director of its first production in 1909, Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People;* he spoke on "The Educational Value of the Drama in College." Sidney Kingsley, who was an active member of the Club during his undergraduate days, spoke of the late Professor A. M. Drummond and the late

drama critic George Jean Nathan in his speech "The Professor and the Critic."

An alumni banquet was held in June to conclude the anniversary festivities. At this time Mr. Julius Zieget, Club President in 1909-10, presented the First President's Prize. He presented a $250.00 cash award for significant contribution to theatre at Cornell to Frederick Congdon who directed Dylan Thomas' *Under Milk Wood*. Mr. Congdon received an M.A. degree in September, and now is director of The Little Theatre, Corpus Christi, Texas.

Other productions given by the Club during the year were John van Druten's *Bell, Book and Candle; The Rivals;* Anouilh's *Antigone;* and *The Taming of the Shrew*.

Special lectures and exhibits were also sponsored during the year. Professor Barnard Hewitt of the University of Illinois presented the Forbes Heerman's lecture, which he titled "The American Theatre Yesterday and Today." The Cornell University Theatre also sponsored Donald Oenslager's lecture, "Scene Design Today," in conjunction with the Festival of Contemporary Arts. Exhibits of Cornell Dramatic Club memorabilia were displayed in the Main Library and in Willard Straight Hall, the student union building, as added features of the commemoration.

Appointments

Alabama Polytechnic Institute: John W. Gray, Anne Torrans, instructors.

College of the Pacific: Halvor Hansen, assistant professor.

Colorado State University: James A. Stitzel, assistant professor and director of forensics.

Cornell University: Edmund C. Nuttall, assistant professor.

Eastern Michigan University: William G. Holsopple, assistant professor.

Florida State University: Wayne C. Minnick, professor and head of department; Bernarr Cooper, associate professor; Richard Hahn, Dorothy Rayner, instructors.

Furman University: Wade Waddy Banks, instructor.

George Pepperdine College: Lewis T. Fulks, instructor and director of drama.

Georgetown College: Suzanne Lows, director of forensics; Harold Hunt, director of drama.

Goshen College: Jesse Yoder, assistant professor.

Howard College: Robert Mashburn, instructor and director of theatre; John Johnson, Nancy Jo Luther, instructors.

Idaho State College: Allen Blomquist.

Illinois State Normal University: Keith C. Davidson, assistant professor; George A. Soderberg, assistant professor.

Indiana University: Robert C. Jeffrey, assistant professor and director of forensics; Mrs. Mary Mann, assistant professor; John A. Mills, Rue C. Johnson, Robert D. Hennon, lecturers.

Kansas State Teachers College: Richard Hildreth; Joe Rossillion, technical director for theatre.

Kansas State University: Dennis F. Denning, instructor; Mrs. Anita Taylor, instructor and director of forensics.

Kent State University: William Weidner, supervisor of public school training of speech and hearing therapists.

Lamar State College of Technology: George E. Bogusch, instructor; William H. Veatch, visiting professor in forensics.

Louisiana State University: S. Leroy Harms, assistant professor.

Marshall College: Melville Hopkins, chairman of department, replacing A. O. Ranson who will devote full time to teaching; Andrew Paesani, Jr., Agnes Porter, instructors.

Montclair State College: Karl Moll, Michael Marge.

Northeastern University: Robert J. Ferullo, instructor.

Northern Illinois University: Willard Welsh, David Williams, associate professors; William W. Vilhauer, assistant professor; Lila Lewis, Harold Chastain, instructors.

Northwestern University: George A. Sanborn, David R. Dickson, Charles J. Gaupp, Earl R. Harford, Jr., assistant professors; Mary Louise Hall, Doyle B. McKinney, John E. Van Meter, instructors.

Ohio State University: George P. Crepeau, assistant professor; Robert P. Lacy, James S. Bost, Robert D. Kibler, instructors.

Pennsylvania State University: George Garganus, Robert E. Dunham, Charles E. Reed, William Simington, instructors.

Purdue University: Ronald F. Reid, Henry E. Spuehler, assistant professors; Robert R. Boren, Robert A. Cowan, Phillip K. Tompkins, instructors.

San Fernando Valley State College: James Egbert, associate professor; Mary Jane Watkins, James Morgan, assistant professors; Lee Granell, instructor.

State University of Iowa: Douglas Ehninger, Glynn Wickham, visiting professors; Peter Arnott, visiting director of drama; Philip A. Benson, assistant professor; James Gousseff, John Kuiper, David Thayer, instructors.

Teachers College, Columbia University: William Canfield, associate and lecturer.

University of Connecticut: Noel Matkin, audiologist.

University of Florida: Donald E. Williams, assistant professor; Robert Keyworth, instructor.

University of Houston: G. Jack Gravely.

University of Illinois: John J. O'Neill, professor and director of the speech and hearing clinics; Bernhardt Russell Works, assistant professor and technical director of theatre; Theodore J. Barnes, assistant professor. Mr. O'Neill's appointment brings together the Speech Clinic, founded in 1940 by Severina E. Nelson, and the Hearing Center, directed the past ten years by E. Thayer Curry. Professors Nelson and Curry will concentrate on teaching and research.

University of Kansas City: Walter Murrish, associate professor; Durward Redd, instructor in theatre and costumer; C. B. Gilford, lecturer in playwriting.

University of Pittsburgh: Kalman A. Burnim, assistant professor.

University of Virginia: Robert Wayne Smith, assistant professor.

University of Washington: Walter Stevens, assistant professor.

Saint Louis University: Barbara Seelye, instructor; Frank B. Wilson, Robert O. Butler.

Stanford University: James Kerans, assistant professor; Jon Ericson, Raeburn Heimbeck, Henry Breitrose, instructors.

West Virginia Wesleyan College: William C. Seifrit, Jr., assistant professor.

PROMOTIONS

Central Michigan University: Emil Pfister, head of the department.

Colorado State University: Richard A. Hopkins, Kenneth I. Periman, assistant professors.

Cornell University: George A. McCalmon, professor; Forrest D. Tucker, director of forensics.

DePauw University: Robert O. Weiss, associate professor; James F. Elrod, assistant professor.

Eastern Michigan University: Marion Stowe, professor; William H. Bos, associate professor.

George Pepperdine College: Warren S. Jones, head of the department; Edward Ohanian, associate professor.

Illinois State Normal University: Charles Arthur White, head of the department; Stanley G. Rives, director of forensics.

Kent State University: Thomas R. McManus, assistant professor; Louis O. Erdmann, instructor and technical director.

Lamar State College of Technology: Judson D. Ellertson, assistant professor.

New York State College for Teachers: Paul Bruce Pettit, professor.

Northeastern University, Boston: Eugene J. Blackman, chairman, Department of Drama, Speech and Music.

Northern Illinois University: Louis Lerea, head of the department. W. V. O'Connell, former head, has requested opportunity to devote full time to teaching.

Northwestern University: Charles F. Hunter, professor of radio, television, film; James F. Jerger, associate professor of audiology; Keith Graham, assistant professor of speech correction; Russel Windes, Jr., assistant professor of public address.

Ohio State University: George L. Lewis, associate professor.

Ohio Wesleyan University: Donald C. Eyssen, chairman of the department.

Purdue University: Sam M. Marks, professor; Keith S. Montgomery, Joseph G. Stockdale, Jr., Betty Ann Wilson, associate professors.

San Fernando Valley State College: Charles S. Mudd, associate professor.

Stanford University: Hall Martin, instructor.

State University Teachers College, Fredonia, N. Y.: Alan L. McLeod, associate professor.

University of Houston: David Larsen, chairman of the drama department.

University of Illinois: King W. Broadrick, Martin T. Cobin, associate professors; Naomi W. Hunter, assistant professor; Jane B. Archer, instructor.

University of Michigan: N. Edd Miller, professor; Henry R. Austin, assistant professor.

University of Southern California: Victor P. Garwood, professor; John Blankenship, associate professor.

University of Washington: Thomas Scheidel, assistant professor.

Queens College: Arthur Bronstein, associate professor.

ON LEAVE

Concordia College: Donald C. Spencer, director of the theatre, is spending the academic year in study at the University of Wisconsin. Dale Miller is taking his place at Concordia.

Indiana University: Richard Moody, director of theatre, is combining a sabbatical leave and a Guggenheim Fellowship to spend 1959-60 in England studying the history of American actors and American plays on the English stage in the nineteenth century. During Moody's absence, Hubert Heffner is directing the theatre.

Kansas State University: John L. Robson is on leave for the year, with the Overseas Branch of the University of Maryland, teaching communications in Germany.

Kent State University: William H. Zucchero, associate director of the theatre, is spending the year in study at Ohio State University.

Lamar State College of Technology: Arnold C. Anderson is spending the year in study at Louisiana State University.

Montclair State College: Howard Fox, director of the theatre, has been awarded a grant of $3,000 by the college to complete his degree this semester.

Northwestern University: Walter B. Scott, Jr., associate professor of dramatic literature, is in France for the year on a Fulbright.

Rockford College: Atwood Hudson, director of the clinic, has been awarded the Mary Emerson Lathrop Leave of Absence for the first semester. In her absence, Eugene Covelli has been appointed instructor to teach general speech and assist in the clinic.

Rutgers University, Newark: Arthur A. Eisenstadt is on a Fulbright in England this year.

Stanford University: Kenneth Clark is spending the year in study for a doctorate in creative writing at the State University of Iowa. Robert Loper spent the summer as visiting director of the Fine Arts Festival at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. During the year he will be in England doing research in Elizabethan literature.

State University of Iowa: Orville Hitchcock is on leave the fall session for reading and research. James Clancy has a Ford Foundation grant for the year (see *QJS*, April).

University of Florida: Douglas Ehninger, to teach, fall semester, at State University of Iowa.

University of Illinois: Kenneth Burns is on sabbatical leave the first semester to observe methods of teacher training.

University of Kansas City: Douglas Russell is continuing his studies at Yale on a Danforth Foundation fellowship.

University of South Dakota: James F. Kavanagh has been awarded a Danforth scholarship for the year to study at the University of Wisconsin. His position is being filled by James A. McDearmon of the University of Denver.

Personals

Bower Aly, University of Oregon, was given a Distinguished Service Award by the National University Extension Association, at its 44th annual convention, Syracuse, in April. The award was made in recognition of his services as executive secretary of the NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials, and especially for his editing *The Discussion and Debate Manual,* used annually by about 100,000 high school students. Mr. Aly has edited the handbooks for twenty-seven years.

Winton H. Beaven, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, Potomac University, Takoma Park, Maryland, this fall became academic dean at Washington Missionary College, Takoma Park.

Charles Bilyeu, Idaho State College, has returned from a year's leave for study at the University of Southern California and Pasadena Playhouse. He played roles in Playhouse productions, and acted in a number of TV dramas, including *The Texan* and *Playhouse Ninety.*

Glenn R. Capp, Baylor University, was special lecturer at Brooke Army Medical School Hospital Administration Institute at Ft. Sam Houston in June.

Robert D. Clark, University of Oregon, gave a special series of lectures in rhetoric and public address at Stanford University in May.

Martin Cobin, University of Illinois, was guest critic at Michigan State's fifth Apple Blossom Festival in May. He will be visiting lecturer and critic at the eleventh annual oral reading clinic, State University of South Dakota, in October.

Lionel Crocker of Denison University was critic at the speaking and debate events, American Institute of Banking, in Philadelphia in May.

Charles Dwyer, New York University, has received the first "Great Teacher Award" given by the University alumni. Awards are to be given each year to three members of the faculty, which now has about 4,200 members. The citation carries a cash award of $1,000. Professor Dwyer has been at NYU since 1923. During the years he has taught public speaking to thousands of students at the School of Commerce campus, and has directed various off-campus forums and conducted many extension classes.

Charles Goetzinger, director of forensics at Kansas State University, has resigned to join the Bureau of Continuation Education, University of Colorado.

Earl R. Harlan, Purdue University, was narrator for the outdoor historical drama, *Unto These Hills,* at Cherokee, North Carolina. He

also gave a class in oral interpretation for members of the cast.

Kenneth Harwood, University of Southern California, has been elected a director of Alpha Epsilon Rho, national honorary radio-television fraternity.

Frederic W. Hile, El Camino College, has taken a position as higher education executive with the California Teachers Association.

Richard Hay of Stanford was staff designer for the Oregon Shakespearean Festival at Ashland. He also designed the stage of the new Elizabethan theatre there, opened this summer.

Edward Hutchinson, Kent State University, has returned after leave for study.

Paul Kozelka, Teachers College, Columbia, conducted a workshop in educational dramatics this summer for teachers in schools administered by the Arabian American Oil Company in Saudi Arabia.

Joseph H. Mahaffey of Air University, Maxwell, Alabama, served as speech consultant to NATO in Europe this summer.

Francine Merritt of Louisiana State University was guest critic at Calvin College, Michigan, Interpretation Festival, in April.

Keith S. Montgomery, of Purdue, has been awarded a university research foundation grant to study the public speaking of leaders of Indiana, 1850-1950.

Wilbur E. Moore, head of the speech department at Central Michigan University, is now Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Robert Moulton, University of Minnesota, did the choreography for *Grasslands*, a ballet given in a command performance before Queen Elizabeth by the Royal Winnipeg Ballet Company, July 24, on the occasion of the Queen's visit to Canada.

George A. McCalmon, director of the Cornell University Theatre, directed *The Golden Crucible*, an outdoor historical drama given in Pittsburgh, June 27-September 5, as a feature of Pittsburgh's bicentennial festival.

Harold J. O'Brien of Pennsylvania State University has been appointed assistant to the dean of liberal arts. David M. Jabusch is replacing Professor O'Brien as director of Men's Debate.

Robert P. Newman, University of Pittsburgh, lectured on propaganda analysis and persuasion at Knox College, Spaldings, Jamaica, British West Indies, in August.

Robert T. Oliver of Pennsylvania State University made two trips to the Orient this spring. In March he went to Korea to be awarded the Presidential Medal. In April he participated in a conference on Far Eastern Affairs at Osaka, Japan.

Norman Philbrick, Stanford University, has returned after a year's leave to study early American drama, at Harvard, Yale and New York libraries.

Ross Scanlan, College of the City of New York, and Joseph F. Smith, University of Hawaii, are exchanging positions this year.

Alfred Sensenbach, Stanford University, designed a pageant based upon the history of the Mormon Battalion, for Brigham Young University. The pageant was given at Provo, Utah, May and June, to audiences estimated at 45,000.

Tex Smiley, director of radio and television, Kansas State Teachers College, has resigned to take a position with the General Electric Company.

Donald K. Smith is now chairman of the speech department, University of Minnesota. Under a five year rotation plan for chairman, William S. Howell has served his term.

George T. Tade, formerly professor of speech and dean, Greenville College, Greenville, Illinois, is now dean of Chapman College, Orange, California.

Jacobus tenBroek of Stanford University has been appointed a fellow at the center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Woodrow J. Borah, who returned this summer from a year's research in Spain, will serve as chairman of the Stanford department during Professor tenBroek's leave.

Hal Todd, Idaho State College, toured New Zealand and the South Pacific with the Idaho State College players this summer. This fall, he has a Ford Foundation dramatists observer program grant to study Broadway Productions.

Robert G. Tuttle, director of forensics at Colorado State University, has resigned to enter industry.

John Ulrich, University of Pittsburgh, is now assistant dean in the Division of Humanities. He will continue to teach some speech courses.

Roy Umble, Goshen College, was speech therapist at the Elkhart County Rehabilitation Center in Elkhart, Indiana, this summer.

Forest L. Whan, Kansas State University, has concluded his Iowa radio-TV survey series after twenty-one annual studies.

George Willey, Stanford University, is radio and television editor of the *Palo Alto Times*.

G. Harry Wright, Kent State University, this summer conducted a four week flying tour of six European countries, with a troup of thirty players.

SUMMER VISITORS AND STAFF

Jack E. Douglas, University of Oklahoma, at Cornell University.

Gaylan Collier, director of theatre at Abilene Christian College, at Idaho State College.

Thorrel Fest of the University of Colorado, at University of Hawaii.

From Indiana University, Robert Milisen at Morehead College and the University of Wisconsin; Hubert Heffner at Tulane University and the University of Michigan; J. Jeffery Auer at Miami University, Northwestern University, and University of Wisconsin.

The Public Address Lecturer at the Ohio State University was the Reverend Lawrence J. Flynn, S.J., of Milford Novitiate. He spoke on the meaning of *status*.

Richard deLaubenfels of Yankton College, taught speech correction and directed the clinic at South Dakota University.

At Teachers College, Columbia University: Richard Norman, Barnard College; Walter Beaupre, Moravia College; Robert Leppert, Paterson State College.

Douglas Ehninger, University of Florida, at Stephen F. Austin College, Nacogdoches, Texas.

Roy Tew, University of Florida, at the University of Alabama and at Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

Guests at the University of Michigan to meet informally with future teachers were: Eugene Bahn, Wayne State University; Herbert L. Curry, Central Michigan University; Catherine Forbes, Saginaw Public Schools; B. Earl Sloan, Cody High School, Detroit; James N. Holm, Kent State University. Wilbur E. Moore, Central Michigan University, replaced Professor H. Harlan Bloomer in speech correction.

At University of Minnesota, Kathrine Thorne, director of the speech clinic at the University of Buffalo; Marjorie Magner, Principal of the Clarke School for the Deaf. In addition to her courses, Miss Magner worked in the sixth annual Conference for the Parents of Deaf Children. This conference was held in Minnesota's Center for Continuing Education, in August. Norma Harris of the Lexington School for the Deaf, New York City, taught a demonstration class in training deaf children.

William Perkins, University of Southern California, at the University of Missouri.

University of Southern California, Carroll Arnold of Cornell University, Charlotte Wells of the University of Missouri, and O. G. Brockett of the State University of Iowa.

SUMMER PRESENTATION. In May, Gladys L. Borchers, University of Wisconsin, presented 76 American speech books to the German Speech Association, at their fifth annual convention in Coburg. The books were on display during the convention, and then were divided, half to the University of Marburg and half to the University of Bonn. Each university will maintain a library of select American speech books. Each book carries a bookplate which reads: "Presented to the Deutscher Ausschuss Für Sprechkunde Und Sprecherziehung by the Departments of Education and Speech of the University of Wisconsin, with the cooperation of American Publishers, The Speech Association of America, and the United States Information Service."

The project came as a result of correspondence Professor Borchers had with German professors, who had inquired as to whether speech books they were receiving as gifts were representative. A poll of speech teachers was conducted, and a list of 116 "best" books was compiled. Publishers kindly supplied 76 of the titles, and Martin Bryan, chairman of the SAA committee on Assistance to Foreign Universities, arranged for transportation of the books at government expense.

Through private subscription Miss Borchers was able to procure four-year subscriptions to *Speech Monographs, Educational Theatre Journal, Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, The Speech Teacher,* and *QJS*. These are to be sent to the president of the German Speech Association, who is currently Professor Paul Tack, University of Bonn.

The library of the late E. C. Mabie, State Univertity of Iowa, has been purchased by the Chicago Undergraduate Division of the University of Illinois. The collection includes 1400 books on speech and theatre and about 700 plays.

university of denver
SCHOOL OF SPEECH

examples of advanced programs of study

MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE

52½ graduate quarter hours without thesis
45 graduate quarter hours with thesis

major concentrations	cognate areas
Discussion and Public Address	Communication Methodology
Speech and Hearing Disorders	Psychology
Communication Methodology	Theatre Arts
Oral Interpretation	Radio and TV

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DEGREE

majors	minors	cognate areas
Public Address and Discussion	Speech Pathology	Communication Methodology
Speech Pathology and Hearing	Communication Methodology	Psychology and Special Education
Theatre Arts	Oral Interpretation	English Literature
Communication Methodology	Mass Media	Business Administration or Social Science
Mass Media	Communication Methodology	English Literature

ROCKY MOUNTAIN SPEECH CONFERENCE

29th Annual General and College Meeting ..... February 11, 12, and 13
29th Annual High School Meeting ..... February 19 and 20

1960 SUMMER SESSION

8th Workshop for Directors of Forensics ..... June 27-July 29
25th Summer High School Institute ..... June 27-July 29
14th Summer Laboratory in Interpersonal Communication .... June 20-Aug. 19
13th Summer Workshop in Basic Communication ..... June 20-July 23

autumn quarter
September 17-December 4, 1959

winter quarter
January 4-March 18, 1960

spring quarter
March 28-June 10, 1960

summer session
June 19-August 18, 1960

for further information write:

ELWOOD MURRAY, Ph.D., Director
School of Speech, Box A
University of Denver
Denver 10, Colorado